

A LITTLE
STONE,
Pretended to be out of the
MOUNTAIN,
Tried, and found to be a Counterfeit,
OR AN
EXAMINATION & REFUTATION
OF
M^r. LOCKYERS
LECTURE, Preached at *Edinburgh*,
ANNO 1744. Concerning the MATTER of the
VISIBLE CHURCH.

And afterwards Printed with an APPENDIX for
Popular Government of single CONGREGATIONS.

Together with an
EXAMINATION, in two APPENDICES
Of what is said on the same purposes in a LETTER
of some in *Aberdeen*, who lately have departed
from the Communion and Government of this Church.

By JAMES WOOD, Professor of Theol. in *S. Andrews*.

EDINBURGH,
Printed by ANDREW ANDERSON, for George Johnston,
Robert Brown, and are to be sold at their Shops.



TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE,
J O H N
EARLE of CASSILS.
LOD KENNEDY.

My



the wise observing King uttered
that of making of Books
there is no end, was never more veri-
fied in any then it is in the present age,
wherein, scribunt docti indoctique,
every smatterer and every fancie-full
head must have the Presse trawel to
bring forth their froathy conceptions:

And Presses by many are made use of as engines to discharge
revylings, reproaches, and blasphemies against the God of
Heaven, his blessed Truths, wayes and Ordinances. For
my self, I can say in truth, it hath not hitherto been my
ambition to increase wearinesse of the flesh by much Reading;
And that now I come this way to the worlds view, 'tis not of
mine own meer chaise, but because a necessity was laid upon
me. The Author with whom I have to do in this ensuing
debate, having not only opened his mouth to Preach in the

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

most eminent place in this Land, but also *Adventured to Write and Print* against the Orthodox Doctrine teaching the constitution and Government of the Visible Church of Christ, revileing in speciall the Church in this Land (yet through its side also striking at all the Orthodox Churches in Europe) as no Church, but a dead carcasse having neither matter nor form of a true Church, a nest of unclean birds, idolatrons, &c. And thereupon charging with a great deal of confidence and big words, all truly Godly to come out of it and to separate from it: It was by some Reverend and Godly men thought expedient, that (altho there appear little or nothing in what is said by him, which may brangle the mind of any judicious Reader: Yet because it is a thing usuall to adversaries of the Truth, if what they say, be it never so weak, get not an Answer, to brag of it as unanswerable; And unsettled minds that have not their senses exercised to discern good and evil, are ready to be taken with any thing busked up with gay words, and so to be carried about, like weather-Cocks with every wind of Doctrine, as many sad examples of this time prove,) an Answer should be returned to him, lest truth should so much as seem to suffer prejudice any way. And this taske they were pleased to lay upon me. Who albeit I do, and cannot but ingenuously acknowledge my self one of the least and weakest Servants of Christ, and that many others there are in this Church, who might far more worthily acquit themselves in this service: Yet durst not withstand the motion, having so clear a Calling, and considering withall how I stand oblidged, in my station, to maint. in the true Religion, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, by the mercy of God established amongst us, in common with the rest of the Lords people in the Land, by Solemn Vow and Covenant, and more parti-
cularly

The Epistle Dedicatory.

cularly by the Lords bringing me, who had been in my young-
er years educated, as to many things, in a contrary way,
to the acknowledgment of the truth, in a very gracious man-
ner, with a strong hand, and in much long-suffering patience,
whereby he waited to be gracious, that he might be exalted in
shewing mercy on me.

Haply it will be matter of talking to some, that this of mine
has been so long in coming forth after Mr. Lockier publi-
shed his. But it is not unknown to many who have been wit-
nesses to my diligence, that my Answer was in readinesse
within a few Moneths after his Peece came to my hands, and
the task was laid upon me. And had come abroad if several
difficulties had not interveened,

Now when it is to be published, I desire humbly to present
it to your Lordship first, and under your Honourable name to
the view of the world. I must spare to expresse all the great
causes obliging me so to do: Because to expresse them would
not only be, haply inexpedient, But also would be, I know,
unsavoury to your self, whom I have alwayes found desirous to
aprove your self in reality of welldoing, but never liking well
to hear of other mens euges. Only this much I cannot for-
bear and must begge your Lordships leave to say. The per-
sonall obligations which you have laid upon me by a continu-
ed tract of undeserved respects, ever since the first time I
was known to your Lordship, would require a worthier testi-
mony of acknowledgment, then is this mean present, or any
thing else my small store of abilities can afford. But to speak
truth, it is not so much any personall concernment that hath
engaged my heart to your Lordship, as that which hath en-
doared you to all who know the truth and you: That grace
which God hath vouchsafed upon you to walk in tendernesse
and closenesse with himself in your privat course and with
constant

No Epistle Dedicatorie.

constant zeal to improve your publick station wherein ye have stood, for promoting the interest of Religion and righteousness and the good of Gods people without byasse or wavering in any revolution of times (wherewith many turning upon the axle-tree of their own self-interests, have whirled about) the sweet fruit whereof, I doubt not but you find in these glowmie dayes, and trust shall abide with you to the end, through the mercy of the Lord whose gifts and graces are without repentance.

I will not adventure upon such severe self-deniednesse to speak more of what I have had the happinesse to be acquainted with, in your Lordship. I hope this testimony of my sense of the obligation I ly under to honour your Lordship shall finde favourable acceptance at your hands. I will not presume (for indeed it were presumption) to commend my work in it: I pretend to nothing therein, but that, through the Grace of God, I have ingenuously and in simplicity, tho in much weaknesse, spoken for truth: But the matter it self is precious and of great weight, consisting of two great interests of Christ Jesus his Visible Church, which is his Visible Kingdom on earth. The one touching the qualifications of the persons that are to be acknowledged members of his Visible Church, and so, in effect, comes to be a Question de finibus, of the marches of his Visible Kingdom: The other touching the matter and way of the externall Visible Government thereof.

As to the former, my Author has so straitned the bounds of Christs Visible Church, that by his sentence none are to be acknowledged as members thereof, and consequently to be under the Ministeriall dispensation of the publick Ordinances of Christ, the ordinary means of saving souls, but such as are already and antecedently found to be savingly converted,

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

ted, regenerated and sealed of God for his by the Holy Spirit, if not in the truth of the object (which yet most part of his reasoning and discourse pteads for) yet in the positive judgement of very spirituall and discerning men: And that as some others of his way further lay out the matter, upon triall and proof thereof given, by a conversation led without the omission of any known duty, or commission of any known sin: A publick declaration of their knowledge in the fundamentalls and of other points of Religion necessary to lead a life without scandall, together with a narration of the experimentall work of their Effectuall Calling unto Repentance and faith: And all Churches that are not constituted of only such matter as this are, to our Author, wrong constitute. In the former part of this Examination, my labour is to discover the unvarramablenesse and contrariety of this Tenent, to the Word of God; And to shew that all who being of years does seriously profess the Christian faith, and subjection to be disciplin'd and governed by the Ordinances of Christ, ought to be admitted into the fellowship of his Visible Church, without any necessity of putting them to a triall touching their inward spirituall estate, and judging upon the same whether regenerate or not, as to that effect: And are to be dealt with, by Pastours and privat Christians in their respective wayes as these that are within, 1 Cor. 5. 12. Upon this point I have insisted the more largely, because not so fully and of purpose handled by others before. And it is, of a truth, of greater importance then many are aware of. 'Tis far from my thoughts to charge our Independent Brethren with any perverse designe in taking up and following that opinion which I dispute against. Many of them, known to me by their writings, especially these worthy Ministers in New-England, Cotton, Hooker, Shepheard, Norton, &c.

The Epistle Dedicatorie

I do from my heart reverence as godly and faithfull servants of Christ, and as burning and shining lights in the Reformed Church: But I think verily, the specious notion of a pure Visible Church has dazzled their eyes, and led them apace away which in it self, beside that it hath no warrant in the Word of God, should it get footing in the world, tends to the ruine & loss of many souls, and to the bringing of the greatest prejudice to the present Cause and Churches, that any thing ever yet did since the first Reformation from Popery: And I am persuaded that, albeit the intension of those holy and reverend men abettors of it, be honest and from simplicity of heart; Yet Satan is under-board (let no man offend at this I say, Peters example teacheth us, that Satan may abuse good mens Zeal and intentions for Christ to wicked ends, contrair to his Cause) Satan, I say, is under-board driving that wicked designe: For if that be the rule and modell of constituting the Visible Church, which they give us, are not all the Reformed Churches by this means condemned of wrong constitution, & razed out of the account of true Visible Churches, as not being conformed, nor ever having been set up according to that modell? And what could more gratifie the Roman Antichrist and his followers then to yeeld this? Again, is there not hereby a ground laid to Question all Administration of Ordinances that has been in them, and to justifie the wilde fancy of Seekers, denying that there is, or hath been for many ages any Church or Ordinances in the world? Moreover when as none of the Reformed Churches at this day are thus constitute, if that modell should have place, must not either all of them be dissolved and cast down to the ground, that new ones may be reared up, of some few precious ones picked out of their ruines, or to the effect they may consist only of persons regenerated and sealed by the Spirit, all other persons

The Epistle Dediestone.

persons who, albeit they professe the truth, subject themselves to Ordinances, yet come not up so far as to obtain a positive sentence, that they are regenerate upon such inward evidences, as these men require, must be all cast out and banished the Church, put amongst those that are ^{to} be, without, 1 Cor. 5. 12, left destitute of the custody of spiritual Discipline, Pastoral instruction, inspection, and authority: And so exposed to be a prey to Satan and his emissaries, Jesuits, Hereticks and erroneous spirits whatsoever, to be led away unto whatsoever pernicious soul-destroying errors, or to turn black Atheists. That this is a needlesse fear, but a reall consequent of this way, is too too clear, by the sad examples of many in these times, who living without the pale of true Visible Churches and not subject to the shepherds staffe and vigilancy, are run out into so many wilde errors in Religion as never age of the Christian Church saw the like. Touching the other head, the Author in his Appendix pleadeth for two things: 1. That the power and exercise of Church Government, should be in the hands of the whole body, or community of Professors as well as of the Officers appointed by Christ in the Church. A Tenet we heard of in the Christian Church, untill Morellus in France, Anabaptists, and Brownists fancied it, and, as contrary to the Word of God (which to Ministers and other Officers appointed by Christ in his Church is contradistinguished from common Professors, attributeth the name of Rulers, assigns the work of Ruling, and prescribes the rules of right governing, but never to the people) so cannot but unavoidably draw after it much confusion and frequent schisms in the Church of God, whereof experience affordeth plenty of examples. 2. That the power of Government should be solely, namely, and Independently in a single Congregation. A Tenet

that

The Epistle, Dedicatorie.

that besides the contrariety thereof to the Word of God and the very light of nature, carrieth with it a multitude of gross absurdities and inconveniencies. By this means let a particular Congregation of 30. or 20. or fewer, 10. or 7. persons (for of so few may a Church, as our Brethren say, be completely constitute) run into never so grosse an error, as to Excommunicate a person unjustly, to hold and maintain Heresie in Doctrine, to set up idolatrous worship, there is no Ecclesiastick authoritative remedy left under Heaven to rectifie it: All Church-communion amongst the Churches of Christ is taken away: The unity of Christs sheep-fold, the Visible Church upon earth is dissolved, and Christ should have as many visible bodies as there are particular Congregations: A Minister could not perform any Ministeriall act out of his own Congregation: Not Preach but as a privat. gifted Brother: Not Administer the Sacraments out of his own Congregation; nor give the Sacrament to a member of another Congregation (as Mr. Hooker ingenuously acknowledges, Surv. Part. 2.) admission and ejection of members should only be into, and from a particular Congregation: A child should be Baptized into a particular Congregation only, and not into the Universall Church: And one Excommunicated, cast out only of a particular Congregation, because the power extends no further: Way is made to let in all errors and heresies, and as many Religions as there are particular Congregations, and none can hinder it in an Ecclesiastick way, and many more absurdities should follow, as Learned and Godly men have judiciously observed. Contrair to those Assertions, is my second Part employed for vindication of the true way of Government which Christ has instituted in his Word, and in great mercy set up in this Church, to wit, by his Ministers and Officers, not Lording over the people

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

people of God in a Papall or Prelaticall way (as this Author either mistakes or calumniates) but Ministerially under Christ the only Lord of his Church, Ruling them according to the Rule of his Word, in a way of rationall obedience: And that in a way of communion and association of Churches, and subordination of lesser associations unto greater and larger, as the Lord grants by his providence conveniency. On this I have not insisted so largely as the matter it self might afforded occasion of discourse: Because it has been by learned and reverend men already so fully debated, the proofs of the truth so clearly made out, and all contrary Objections so abundantly discussed and satisfied, that I had little or nothing to add: Yet I trust I have through the Lords help, in some measure, discovered the insufficiency and invalidity of what is brought by this Author, who, I wonder much should have adventured to present the world with such a discourse upon the matter after so learned labours of others, as are extant upon the same.

I have also in two Appendices taken into consideration what is said upon these same points by some in Aberdene lately turned aside from the truth, in a Letter of theirs directed to some Godly men in the South, May 1652. The reasons moving me hereto were 1. Because of their correspondence with Mr. Lockiers Peere, and soe much they have been in a manner his proselytes. Then having some time had more particular and intimat acquaintance with some of them, it would be to me matter of much joyning in the Lord, if I could be instrumentall to discover to them the weaknesse of the grounds whereupon they have fallen from their steadfastnesse, that so, if possible, which I wish from my heart, they might be moved to remember whence they have fallen, to repent and so do their first works: And finally that what ever should be the effect as to them, the irrelevancy of the causes of their departure,

ture,

The Epistle Dedicated.

ture being laid open, where might see no cause why any should be shaken with their fall. And blessed be God: there are not yet many in this Land, that have followed them in this. What may be afterward, the Lord who sees the thoughts of mens hearts afar off knoweth. Times indeed are sifting. And the ignorance of many, the base earthly time-serving minds of others, unadvised principles in some, who, may be sees not yet the far end of their consequences, may prove an advantage to seducement & produce more defection from the profession of the truth, if temptations continue, then as yet we have seen. But let temptations and trials be what they will, the Cause of Christ, even that part of it which I stand for here, the order & Government of this Church, which he has appointed in his Word, and thereby made known to this Church, shal stand firm. It has been a cup of trembling to all that have hitherto laid siege against it, and a burden upon those to all that have at any time burdened themselves with it, to cut them in pieces: & it will yet prove so to all who will adventure to do the like. And turn their back upon it who will, Christ will not want his witnesses to bear witness against it. Even if need be, by not laying their lives unto the death. And O but that man might count himself highly favoured of God, whom he should honour with that dignity! as that eminent servant of Jesus Christ Mr. Welch spoke in relation to himself of suffering for some branches of the same cause, engaged in his time. But having detained your Lordship too long, I present this testimony, I have given to is according to my weak measure, to you, commending it not only to your favourable acceptance but also to your judicious consideration, and your self unto the Grace of God who has called you unto the witness of the love of the truth; and is able to preserve you therein blameless unto the end. I am

Your Lordships most humble Servant in the Lord,

James Wood.

AN
ADVERTISEMENT
TO THE
READER.

Albeit it hath pleased Mr. Lockier to preface unto his Book two Epistles of his own, and a third of three of his friends, containing many sharp invectives against this Church, and strange Commentaries upon the Lords dispensations toward us, as striking against our Church constitution and Government: Yet I shall not detain the Reader with skimming of the same, being confident that upon the clearing and vindicating of the truth in the following Treatise, these discourses will be found by the Godly and Judicious to be not only bitter against Brethren in affliction (proving them to be Physicians of no value) but injurious to God and his Truth, in ascribing our calamities to our adhering thereto, and judging of the truth of our Religion by the Lords outward dispensations toward us.

AN

An Index of the Sections.

PART. I.

Concerning the Mater of the Visible Kirk.

SECT. I. **M**R. Lockier his Analysis and explication of the Text, *Act. 15. 3.* for laying a ground to his Doctrine concerning the Mater of the Visible Kirk, considered. *p. 1.*

II. His Doctrine pondered and the state of the controversie between us and the Independent Brethren touching the necessary qualification of Members of the Visible Kirk cleared. *16.*

III. His first Classe of Arguments from *Act. 9. 26.* and *2. 47.* and *Heb. 3. 5, 6.* brought as directly holding forth his Doctrine, Answered. *31.*

IV. The Authors Texts which he calls hints and shadows of his Doctrine. *40.*

V. Examination of the proof of his Doctrine by induction. *56.*

VI. Examination of his proofs brought under the name of reason. *83.*

VII. A short modest reply to the bitter ule he maketh of his Doctrine. *102.*

VIII. The Objections he maketh to himself and his Answers thereto, considered. *107.*

IX. Some Arguments confirming our Doctrine and everting the adverse opinion about the necessary qualification of Members of the Visible Kirk. *127.*

APPEND. Wherein is Examined so much of that Letter, written by these of *Aberdene*, who lately have separated from this Kirk upon the Independent grounds, as relateth to the present Question touching the necessary qualification of Members of the Visible Kirk. *168.*

PART. II. *Concerning Kirk Government,*

SECT. I. **M**R. Lockier his first Assertion. That the Eldership within a particular Congregation is not in most weighty

THE INDEX.

weighty things to exert power without the consent and approbation of the Kirk whereof they are, considered. 194.

II. Examination of his 1, 2, 3, 4. Argument. 203.

III. His 5. Argument discussed. 226.

IV. His Argument from common testimony considered and Answered. 251.

V. His Answers to some Objections made against his Assertion from some Passages of Scripture, examined. 255.

VI. His Answers to some other Objections made by way of reason, examined. 263.

VII. His second Assertion touching Presbyteries of many particular Congregations combined, and the true state of the controversy touching this matter between Presbyterians and Independents laid forth. 283.

VIII. His first ground against a Presbytery having authoritative juridicall power over more Congregations, that it is without foundation in the Word, examined. 288.

IX. Examination of his 2. *medium*, that what power of ruling an Eldership hath, it hath it in the same extent with its Pastoral power. 311.

X. Examination of his 3. *medium*, that it destroyes the end for which Kirk power is. 317.

XI. Examination of his 4. *medium*, that a particular Congregation is compleat and sufficient in it self without an associate Presbytery over more Congregations. 325.

XII. A reply to his answers to some Objections wherein separation from, not only the Kirk of *Scotland*, but all the Protestant Presbyterian Kirks, as Idolatrous, is driven at. 340.

APPEND. Wherein is Examined what is said in the forementioned Letter of the new Independents of *Aberdeen*, for the Independent Congregational, and against the Presbyterian way of Kirk-Government. 360.

An

INDEX

Of the Places of

SCRIPTURE

Vindicated or Explained.

Numb. 11. 17.	127.	41. 44.	104.	Phil. 1. 6.	94.
12. 29. 2. 3. 4.	127.	14. 23.	146.	1 Thes. 2. 13; 14.	74. 108.
10. 11. 12. 13.	131.	27. 28.	12.	3. 12.	324.
Prov. 9. 3. 4.	155.	19. 8. 11. 16. 17. 18. 19.	14.	2 Thes. 3. 15.	176.
Isa. 66. 16. to the end.	97.	22. 23.	339. 371.	1 Tim. 2. 10.	119.
James 2. 9.	104.	27.	287.	3. 4.	90.
34. 33.	11. 16.	28.	297.	4. 14.	215. 109.
Dan. 12. 1.	101.	10. 4.	242.	1. 22.	10.
Mal. 1. 11.	95.	20. 23. 24.	66. 126.	17.	10.
Mat. 3. 16.	122.	22. 23.	322.	2 Tim. 2. 6.	10.
7.	121.	Rom. 1. 5. 7. 8. 9.	60. 173.	2. 10.	179.
13. 24. 27.	163.	10. 24. 17.	156.	20.	114.
15. 16. 18. 19.	40. 135.	1. Cor. 1. 10. 31.	62.	21.	163.
18. 19. 16. 17. 18.	217. 304.	3. 10. 10. 17.	86.	22. 25.	116.
22. 23.	181.	22.	116.	Th. 2. 5.	260.
23. 24. 27.	137.	4. 4. 5.	61.	Heb. 3. 5. 6.	37.
26.	244.	5. 4.	217.	2. 7.	178.
27.	119. 136.	6. 13. 19. 20.	171.	2. 10.	31. 54.
28.	34.	12. 13. 14.	77.	13. 20.	273.
29.	291.	1. Cor. 1. 24.	107.	1. Pet. 1. 3.	74.
30. 31. 32.	294.	2. 6.	137.	5. 5.	212. 273.
31.	218.	5. 18. 19. 20.	171.	14.	74.
32. 33.	31.	6. 16.	91.	Rev. 3. 10.	100.
33. 34.	9.	Gal. 1. 22.	74.	9.	53.
34. 35.	21.	4. 9.	64.	11. 1. 2.	44. 76.
35. 36.	359.	6. 5.	11.	13. 6.	104.
36. 37.	11.	Eph. 1. 13.	11.	19. 10.	26.
37. 38.	11.	2. 30. 25.	34.	21.	100.

EXAMINATION OF M^r. LOCKYERS

LECTURE ON ACTS 15. Vers. 3.

Concerning the MATTER of the
VISIBLE CHURCH.

SECTION I.

*Wherein is examined his Analysis and Explication of the
Text, for laying a Ground to his Doctrine, concerning
the Matter of the VISIBLE CHURCH.*

In the entrance I must professe it was a matter of
some wonder to me, when this Piece came first
to my hands, to see a man of such account as M^r.
Lockyer, for grounding his Doctrine he inten-
ded, pitch upon this Passage of Scripture; which
I am ready to think few else would have dreamed
much appearance of weight could been laid on for that purpose.
Sure, a man that would in Preaching hold forth to the People of
God Doctrine as truth and received from the Lords mouth, and
would convince people that it is such, had need be sure that the
Scripture he presents for it, doth indeed carry it, either expressly,
or by necessary and evident consequence. Otherways, as he
doth much wrong his own cause, giving his hearers that are judi-
cious occasion to suspect the Doctrine, can have little or no
ground

ground at all in Scripture, when they see that which is presented to them as the very seat of light, giveth it no light: so he doth notably abuse the Word of God, and I may say, in a kinde, take his Name in vain, before his people, by alledging the Lord to speak and give a testimony to a point, by a Scripture wherein it is not at all intended. Yea let a point of Doctrine be most true and never so certain in it self (such as that maintained in this Lecture is not, as we trust, through the Lords assistance, to make evident) yet to Preach it from a Text that speaketh it not, is an abuse of the Word of God. If there be not just cause of charging this upon Mr. Lockier here, I leave it to be judg'd by all discerning and impartiall Readers from what followeth in this Section.

S. 1. In the next Section I purpose to state the Question in hand as clearly as I can, and ingenuously to bound the differences between us. Now in a word only take notice what Mr. Lockiers purpose intended in this Lecture is, to treat of the proper and allowed matter of a visible Church, which he will have to be such persons only, as are truly converted, sanctified, and sealed by the Spirit of God as his; at least so far as men truly converted and very spiritual can discern (of which additional qualification afterward) and his Text for this Doctrine is, *Acts 15, v. 3. And being brought on their way by the Church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.* Now let's see what the Author bringeth for evidencing his point, or any thing like it, to ly in this Text:

S. 3. The principall things (saith he) in this vers. are these, viz. a Church of the New Test. described by its proper matter, and by a proper effect and operation, which this hath upon such who are indeed turned unto the Lord, and able to discern spirituall beauty, and glory: it causeth great joy to all such. [And being brought on by the Church] what the matter of this Church is, read the next words and they will tell you, — they declared the conversion of the Gentiles, *Page 2. and 3. begin.* *Ans.* That the Holy Ghost here intendeth as the principall purpose, to describe a visible Church of the New Test. by the proper constituent matter thereof, is but the mere conceit of the Author forced upon the Text, and

and no wayes deduceable from the words themselves; the genuine purpose of the words being simply to note some circumstances of Paul and Barnabas and the other Commissioners joyned with them, their journey from Antioch to Jerusalem, whether they were sent for resolution upon the Question then in controversie at Antioch. As 1. The Christian courteous respect that the Church at Antioch put upon them, *they were brought on their way.* 2. What these commissioners did as they were on their journey; that they declared to the Christians that lay in their way, that same thing that they had declared before at Antioch, Chap. 14. v. 27. viz. that God had been mightily with the Preaching of the Gospel even amongst the Gentiles, so that many of them (as the Story relateth the particular countries and places, Chap. 13, and 14.) were converted to the Christian Religion. 3. What effect this produced amongst the Christians to whom it was declared: that *they had great joy at these tydings*, that the Kingdome of Christ was so spreading, and that even the Gentiles were brought in to it. Here indeed are grounds of usefull points of Doctrine: but what is all to that which Mr. Lockier intends, the description of a visible Church by its proper matter? A Church visible to Mr. Lockier is a particular Congregation participating together the Ordinances of Christ. Doth it any wayes appear that the Spirits intention in these words, is to describe unto us what sort of persons were admitted into the constitution of such a Congregation? viz. as he would have it, not any professors whosoever, but such only as were tryed and found, by truly converted, and very spiritual men, able to discern and judge, to be truly regenerate. What evidence is brought to shew that this is intended in the Text? This, to wit, that first it is said, *being brought on by the Church*, and then, sayes he, *what the matter of this Church is*, the next words tell, *they declared the conversion of the Gentiles.* Answer. What? must these latter words be a description of that thing which is mentioned in the first, i. e. the Church, viz. of Antioch (for that is the Church spoken of there) because, forsooth, the one followeth immediately after the other in the series of the narration? I must say this is strange Logick, and interpreting of Scripture. I am not here to deny but the Church of Antioch

rioch did consist of such as are here mentioned, i. e. converted Gentiles: but my purpose is to shew how impertinently the Author hath chosen and made use of this Scripture to be his Text for his Doctrine concerning the matter of a visible Church.

§ 4. That this may yet more clearly appear, I desire the Reader to consider, that the Historian *Luke* is not in these two Clauses of this Verse, pitch upon by Mr. *Lockier* as a ground of his Doctrine, relating the words of one mans continued discourse; so as the one part of them might be taken as exegetick of the other; or as intended to expresse a description of the thing contained in the other; but is relating two diverse actions of two distinct parties, as circumstances of *Paul* and *Barnabas* journey: one, *reall*, of the Church of *Antioch* their Christian courtesie in bringing them on a part of their way: The other (so to call it) *verball*, viz. the discourse that *Paul* and *Barnabas* themselves had amongst the Christians by whom they passed, viz. that the Gentiles were converted to the Christian Faith: so that any man, that hath but half an eye, may easily perceiue that these terms *Church* and *converted Gentiles*, stands not in the words in relation one to another as a *definitum* and a *definitio*, or as a compound and the matter of which it is compounded. Therefore it is but a forcing of the Text, to make up of these two this Doctrine as intended in the words [*A visible Church consists of converted ones as its proper matter*] what ever truth may be in it of itself. This, I said before, I am not questioning now: but would discover the inconsideratenes of chusing and making use of this Text for that purpose, and adds but this; seeing in preaching the Word of God aight, any enunciative Doctrine which is propounded from a Text, if it ly not in the Text, in expresse and formall, or equivalent terms, yet should be deduceable by good consequence from it: I humbly desire that Mr. *Lockier* would build a clear Syllogisme upon any enunciation in this Text, inferring this Conclusion, [*the proper matter of a visible Church is converted ones*] for in this Text it is not said expressly and immediatly, as he would seem to say in the next progresse in these words: *The complexion of a visible Church under the Gospel is here said to be conversion: the constituting matter, converted ones.* This much might suffice for answer to this Text,

as it is alledged by Mr. *Lockier* for to be a proof of the Doctrine intended in this Lecture: for, unlesse it be first supposed that conversion of the Gentiles is here mentioned and set down as a description of the visible Church mentioned before; all the pains taken by him afterward to clear what is meant by conversion, is to little purpose, for proof of the point intended, as from this Text. Yet we shall be at the pains to take into consideration what followeth in the opening up of the Text, lest we seem purposely to passe over any thing which may be alledged to speak for the point maintained by the Author. I confesse it had been fitter that the controversie had been first stated: but I am resolved to follow the tract of Mr. *Lockiers* discourse, that I may shynne the smallest appearance of wronging him. Go we on then.

They declared the conversion of the Gentiles: what conversion was this? A meer outside conversion, pag. 3. Nay, would the Author say, an inside, truly gracious, heart-conversion. *Ans. 1.* Do we, any of us, whom the Author takes for his Adversaries, say that no more at all is meant here but a meer outside conversion? He but aims an Adversary and wrongeth us, by intimating so much. We conceive thus, that by *Conversion* here is meant a forsaking and relinquishing of the Heathnish, and a turning unto and embracing the Christian Religion (as the *Nether Dutch Notes* on the place expound) no wayes excluding, but comprehending under it also the inward heart-turning by true faith to Christ: but withall we think it cannot be warrantably said, that when *Paul* and *Barnabas* made this declaration of the conversion of the Gentiles, they meant that all and every one of these Gentiles turned from Heathenism to the Christian Religion, had also the inward work of gracious conversion and faith in their heart. This had been contrary to truth; for some of the converted Heathens, no doubt, had no more but the profession of Christianity, the preaching of the Gospel being as a draw-net that catches good fishes and bad together, and the outward Kingdom of God, as a field wherein are tares and wheat growing together. Nor yet can it be said that *Paul* and *Barnabas* in that declaration meant, that all and every one of these Gentiles they spake of, were such, *viz.* true heart-converts to their positive judgement, and so far as men truly converted

De Bekeringe] niet, tot de Christlick Religie. i.e. Conversion] niet tot de Christlick Religie

verted and very spirituall were able to discern. This appears not out of the words of the Text: for first, I think the Apostle speaks of Conversion as including gracious heart-conversion, in the *verity* of the thing or *Object*: and not only in the *charitative* judgement of discerning men; tho not *restrictively*. Mr. Lockiers additament, viz. [*According to what a Christian can discern of a Christian, or in so far as men, &c.*] is his own and not the Text; yea I conceive 'tis contrary to the intention of the Text: because I no wayes doubt but the Apostles meant positively that there was amongst these Gentiles heart-conversion in the *verity* of the thing. But that which Mr. Lockier sayes by his additament may be contradictorily opposite to that: men may be accounted heart-converts in the charitable judgement of very discerning Christians, and yet not be heart-converts indeed. 2. Granting that to be the meaning which Mr. Lockier saith to be, in his additament; yet can any thing be alledged from the words, that will import, it must be understood *universaliter de omnibus & singulis*, i. e. universally of all and every one of these Gentiles: and may not be understood as spoken only *de multitudine communiter & indefinitè*, i. e. of the multitude of them? yet forasmuch as Mr. Lockier hath not alledged, much lesse proved the former hitherto; he hath alledged nothing to his purpose in hand. And yet, although he hath both alledged and proven this much, he had said but little to his purpose; unlesse he could also prove that the Apostles, in that declaration, were speaking of these converted Gentiles with relation to stating in visible Church-membership: which thing be onely supposeth, but doth not so much as hint at a proof thereof from this Text.

- S. 6. But go we on to consider his Arguments brought to prove his interpretation of *Conversion* here spoken of (which yet he needed not prove, for we have granted more of it then he craves) that we may see if there be any thing therein making for his main purpose. The 1. lyeth in these words: *Surely if the Brethren had apprehended no more in them* (i. e. the Gentiles, of whom Paul and Barnabas spake) viz. then a meer outside conversion, they would have had little matter of great joy. Answ. 1. We say not that the apprehending of no more, was the matter of this their great

great joy: but will the Author say, that, unless they had apprehended more then outside conversion *in all and every one of them* (which is a thing he must of necessity take along with him, if he will say any thing to his purpose *) they would had little matter for great joy? I think hee'll be advised before he say so. 2. Nor am I of the mind that outside conversion, i. e. embracing of the Profession of the Gospel and Christian Religion, is so little a matter of joy to the people of God, as the Author seems to make account. Sure, it could not but be matter of right great joy to the LORDS true people of the Jews: for to see *Isaiah* perswaded to dwell in the tents of *Shem*, (i. e.) the Gentiles by embracing the profession of the Gospel added to the Common-wealth of *Israel*, and fellowship of the Church of God. And it shall be no small matter of joy to Gentile-Christians when they shall see the body of the Jews ingrafted again into the Church. Even outward professing of, and submitting to the Gospel, is honourable to Christ in the world, and so is spoken of in Scripture: though it alone be not the full duty of men, nor sufficient to save them.

* For his minde is that these Gentiles are spoken of in relation, and as matter of a visible Church, & his doctrine is, that none other, nor one other, no not in a whole Church, are fit matter of a visible Church, but such as are, &c.
S. 7.

I might, ere I went on further, note here, that whereas the Author in the next words propounds the explaining of more tearms then one of his Text (for, saith he, *let us take tearms as they ly, and see how other Scriptures do explain them*) yet in the following discourse, I find all runs upon one tearm, *viz. conversion*, or, *converted ones*: But to insist upon every such small thing, is not worth the while. Let us see what is said further upon that, what these *converted ones* (saith he) *were according to what Christian can discern of Christian is the thing to be inquired into* pag. 3. *Ans.* Nay, not this only: but two other things also, ought to have been inquired into and made out. 1. Supposing that true heart-conversion is understood here; that the Apostles in their declaration affirmed this universally of all and every one of these Gentiles. 2. That in declaring and affirming this, they did speak with relation to their stating in Church-membership: at least that the Historian *Luke* reports it in that relation. Neither of which the Author proveth, or so much as once undertaketh to prove: so that, what followeth, tho granted, makes little for the point he driveth at. But we go on.

Paul

Paul and Barnabas who were master-builders, and surely very seeing men, that they might not make a meer report, took of those converted ones with them, were brought on by the Church. We tell you (as if they had said) of such glad tidings touching the Gentiles: but what they are, see your selves: here they are: discourse with them: see if they have not the same soul-complexion with your selves, whether they have not received the same spirit of Adoption, owning and experiencing the same grace of God which ye do. *Ans.* Here's a pretty fiction or Poësie, but nothing of *Luke's* Text: yea but something quite contrair to it. 1. The Author saith Paul and Barnabas, that they might not make a meer report (viz. touching the Gentiles conversion, but might shew living present instances thereof) took of those converted ones with them. What hint can he give us from the Text for this? it saith a faite other thing, viz. first that they (*i. e.* the Church of *Antioch*) ordained some in joint commission for to go to *Jerusalem* about the question then in controversie: and then, that these Comissioners were brought on their way by the Church, *i. e.* (as *Grorin* exponeth it well, aliquosq; deducti a fidelium quibusdam; *i. e.*) they were convoyed on a part of their journey by some of the Church. This was a Christian, affectionat courtesie, and respect put upon them by the Church: So Mr. *Lockier* himself exponeth it, pag. 2. l. 1, 2, 3. forgetting himself in so short bounds. 2. What hint or ground of the least conjecture can he point us at in the Text, that these Comissioners, when they told the Conversion of the Gentiles, did set up some of those Gentiles, before the Churches by which they passed, to be discoursed with, tryed, and examined concerning their soul-complexion, the Spirit of Adoption, their experiences in the work of grace? *nuga.* 3. He will have those Gentiles whom he thinks the Comissioners brought thus upon the stage, to be the same by whom they were brought on their way. But first, how shall we know that those that brought them on their way were Gentiles and not Jews? for sure, the Church at *Antioch* did not consist of Gentiles only, and it is not like that the whole Church of *Antioch* went along with them, and was thus set up. Again, how will it be made out, that those who brought them on their way, went so far on with them as

Phenice

Phenice and Samaria, where the Declaration was made? *Hug. Gro.* a man well skill'd in the Greek Language, tho' little to be respected in Dogmaticks of Divinity, gives us to understand the contrary, from the genuine signification of the word; for saith he *aliquosque deduci, a quibusdam fidelium: nam quorum non est se commendare iurari, sed honoris causa aliquosque prosequi*: much more might be noted in this passage, but enough. I leave it to all indifferent Readers, if this be not to do violence to the Word of God, and to make the Scripture speak what a man himself fancies: If not, I know not what is. Yet when all is done, one thing is omitted by *Mr. Lockier* in this pretty fiction, which, as is the old *Scarish* Proverb, is the tongue of the Trump. For to all that he makes to have been the substance of the Commissioners Declaration, he should have added this also as spoken by them, *And we assure you that all and every one of the Gentiles converted to Christian Religion, at least all of them that are admitted to the fellowship of a whole Church, not one of them excepted, no, not one, in a whole Church, are just such as these you see; of that same spall-complexion, &c.* Without this, the rest will not give a certain sound to his purpose. And there is as much ground for this as for the rest in the Text, and that is *neq. vola, nec vestigium*.

We proceed. That there was an effectual work (viz. of true saving Grace) wrought in the hearts of those my Text speaks of, I judge will sufficiently appear, by comparing with my Text these Scriptures, *Act. 11. 29, 31, 32. And, 1. Mr. Lockier* suppoeth, at least ought suppose, if he would have his Argument here hold good, that these spoken of in his Text, and these spoken of, *Act. 11. 29. the Grecians*, are the same persons. But first, some judicious Interpreters, namely the *Neiber-Dutches*, understand by these, the Jews that used the Greek tongue and the Greek version of the Bible. And indeed the name is *Ελληνισται*, ordinarily used for those, and not *Εκκλησια* used for the Gentiles: though I know *Beza* and others judge otherways. But however, understand we Gentiles; yet these were but a small part of them spoken of in *Mr. Lockiers* Text, whom *Hugo Grotius*, on the word *id est*, in the Text, reckoneth up thus, *n. Cornelii, Antiochianum, Cy-*

priorum, Pisidarum, Pamphilorum, Lycaonorum, Lycorum.

2. What ever they be, that are spoken of there, *Act. 11.* yet it can not be proven from any thing in these verses cited, that all and every one of them, had an effectuall work of *Living Grace* wrought in their hearts. Nay, nor will the Author himself abide by so much; but will come presently in with this qualification, according to what Christian can discern of Christian: which may be no effectuall saving work at the heart at all. I deny not absolutely that there was such effectuall work wrought in hearts amongst them: But I deny that the Text imports that there was such a work in the hearts of all and every one of them. Ye will say, what then mean these expressions? 1. *the hand* (i. e. the mighty power of the Lord) *was with them* viz. that Preached the Gospel, ver. 21.

2. *A great number believed and turned to the Lord*, *ibidem.*

3. *When he came and had seen the Grace of God*, v. 23. *Ans.*

1. It was no small work of the hand of God to bring these men to embrace the Profession of the Christian Religion. Yet I doubt not but the hand of God was effectuall to more. Only I say, it appeareth not from the Text that it was effectuall to both in a like extension. 2. We know that men are said in Scripture to believe, and to be converted in respect of serious profession: yet I deny not but there was here also, saving heart-believing and Conversion: But it cannot be demonstrate out of the Text, that all of them beleeved and were converted in this sense. 3. By the grace of God, that *Barnabas* is said to have seen, is meant the effectuall working thereof in bringing so many to embrace the Doctrine of the Gospel; as also, I make no doubt, captivating hearts to the obedience of it: but whether all and every one of their hearts is not said. Nay, the very words of *Barnabas* exhortation may seem to give an hint that he spake as supposing it might be otherwayes with some of them, he exhorted them all with purpose of heart to cleave unto the Lord. With purpose of heart; i. e. (saith Beza) *Non frigide nec simulacri, sed sincero & ardenti studio, quod Hebraei totius cordis appellatione significant, ut veterani Syri & Arabi Interpretes.* As if he had said, ye professe now the faith of Jesus Christ: see that ye content not your selves with profession alone, which may vanish: but adhere to him with a sincere, fervent, constant, heart-resolution.

The

The Author goeth on by way of confirmation, thus: *The next verse (viz. Acts 11. 25.) tells us that he found out Saul and brought him to this Church of Antioch, where they abode a whole year: and these Converts were first called Christians. Barnabas is here said to be a man full of the Holy Ghost, and therefore able to taste his communion, — and he and Paul together, might be competently able to give a judgement what they found amongst these first Christians: and I think 'tis very dangerous to say, that as far as they could apprehend, these first Christians had not both name and thing, for which commended; and in which by these Worthies joyed in, pag. 5. Answ. Here is, I may say, much sand without lyme. 1. The Gentiles of whose Conversion, *Act. 15. 3.* speaks, were of many more places besides *Antioch*. Now suppose all here alledged were granted; what evidence can *Mr. Lockier* give us, that *Paul* and *Barnabas*, or any such other persons competentlie able to judge, had staid as long in every one of these other places? 2. But to hold our selves to this Church of *Antioch*; I confesse indeed it were dangerous universally to say, that these first Christians at *Antioch* had not. (I say not only, as *Mr. Lockier* hath it, as far as able men could apprehend, but) in very deed, both name and thing, i.e. gracious heart-Christianness: But I see it not so very dangerous to say that not *all and every one* of them had so much. Nay, I think it very dangerous positively to say they had: for 'tis clearly contrary to what the Scripture speaketh of the effect and successe of the Preaching of the Gospel, and to many passages of this very Story of the *Acts*. 3. True, *Paul* and *Barnabas* were discerning men, able to give a good judgement in so much time, what they found amongst those Christians. But what evidence can the Author give us from the Text, that this was their intended work during that space, to examine and try what heart was in every one of these Professours, and that in relation to constituting them a Visible Church after that tryall, and judgment passed thereupon? The only work we find mentioned in the Text, ver. 26. is their teaching, *they taught much people*. And there is nothing in it so much as hinting at this, that they were not in state of a Visible Church, untill, after that whole years tryall, *Paul* and *Barnabas* had given judgement what they did find amongst*

them as to their inward spiritual estate. Nay, there is a right apparent intimation that all along that years space, they were a Visible Church and so esteemed: *a whole year they assembled themselves with the Church, or, in the Church, &c.* 4. I will note but another thing here. The Author intimateth that *Barnabas*, his being full of the Holy Ghost, is spoken of in that Text in relation to, and as the Principle of tasting, trying, and judging these Christians *loud* complexion for Church communion with them, this is a meer forgery. It being clear as day light, that 'tis mentioned as the reason and Principle of the zealous exhorting them to sincere and constant continuing in the faith.

S. 22.

He goeth on thus. *In particular Churches some competent judgement may be made of every particular member, by able men in a long tract of time. And so are these worthies else where said With this Church to have had intimate communion. Acts 14. 27. 28. — And there they abode a long time with the Disciples, pag. 5. 6.*

Ans. I wonder how Mr. Lockier, speaking of the judgement touching Church members, their qualification as members, talks of it as given by some that are *able men*: when as the way, maintained by his side, of judging and admitting Church members, requireth this to be done by the decisive votes of all and every one in the Church: all which cannot be supposed to be such able men as he speaks of. But to the purpose in hand: true, able men in a long tract of time, having conversed with every particular member of a Church, may be able to give a good judgement of them: but the matter in question is, *in these*, whether such a judgement grounded upon a tryall of so long a time, must be antecedent to their standing in Church-membership. And in the hypothesis of the particular now in hand, whether *Paul* and *Barnabas* had so long a time intimate communion with the *Antiochian* professors, and thereby gave a judgement upon them concerning their spiritual estate, before they were constitute in a Visible Church. This Mr. Lockier should have alledged and made good, if he would had a solide ground for his Doctrine intended. But doth the Passage cited, *Acts 14. 27. 28.* say any thing for this purpose? Now I report my self for judgement upon this, to any Reader of ordinary common capacity; let him but take this to consideration: that

that before the time of this abode at *Antioch*; mentioned *Acts* 14. 28. *Barnabas* after the work of the Gospel begun at *Antioch*, had come thither sent from *Jerusalem*: he and *Paul* had Preached there together a whole year, they had gone in commission sent by the *Antiochian* Christians, with a relief to the distressed Brethren at *Jerusalem*, Chap. 11. and had returned again, Chap. 12. 25. And having stayed there some time, by speciall Divine appointment they are sent abroad through the Nations about to Preach the Gospel: and having after a long peregrination returned again to *Antioch*, then is said that Chap. 14. 28. *and there they abode a long time with the Disciples*. Now were not the *Antiochians* stated in a Visible Church, untill judgement was given upon them after intimat communion in this time of abode? I might bring a multitude of Arguments to prove the contrary from severall passages of the Story going before: But I need go no further then the immediat preceeding Verse, v. 27. *When they were come and had gathered the Church*. But it may haply be said that the Author brings this Passage to shew, not what tryall and knowledge *Paul* and *Barnabas* had of them before they were stated Members in a Church Visible; but what they might had of them to be a warrantable ground of their report made touching them; Chap. 15. 3. Answer. If so, then say I he alledges it to no purpose as to his scope in this Lecture: for his intention is to have *Paul* and *Barnabas*, Chap. 15. 3. speaking of the qualification of these Gentiles in relation to their stating in a Visible Church, and accordingly thereupon to build a generall Doctrine touching the proper matter of a Visible Church.

Adde (saith he) to this, *Acts* 15. where you shall see further S. 13. what is solemnly asserted of these Converts in severall verses, as v. 8. *And God which knoweth the hearts beareth them witnesse, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith*. Here is a Text to some purpose: *God which knoweth the hearts beareth them witnesse, &c. That they have the like powerfull spirituall receptions with the best of them at Jerusalem*: And indeed I think it dangerous for any to affirm that all these expressions might not mean effectuall grace, or else be spoken of some only, but not of the whole.

whole. Compare with this, v. 11. 16, 17, 18, 19. What he concludes, Wherefore my sentence is, &c. pag. 6, 7. Ans. Here is indeed a Text to some; yea to a very great purpose, viz. for the end for which it was spoken by the Apostle Peter, that is, to prove that Circumcision and the rest of the yoke of the Ceremoniall Law, ought not to be imposed upon the Gentiles converted to the Faith. The Argument is clear and undenyable. GOD the Searcher of hearts hath born witness to the Gentiles by giving to them the Holy Ghost, as well as to the Circumcised Jews, and without putting difference, purifying their hearts through faith in Iesus CHRIST Preached by the Gospel alone, without Circumcision and other Ceremoniall Performances. Therefore it is his will, that Circumcision, &c. bee not imposed upon them, as not being necessary to Justification and Salvation. This is the plaine and sole intention and drift of that Passage of Scripture. But sure I am 'tis to little or no purpose, for Mr. Lockiers purpose. For howsoever it be true that 'tis clear from this Text, that there was a work of effectual saving grace amongst these Gentiles spoken of, and I do agree with him this far; that it were dangerous, yea most clearly false and contradictory to the words of the Text, to affirm that these expressions might not mean effectual saving grace; yet I say first, that the Apostle Peter was not here speaking of this work of saving grace, as the necessary qualification for constituting persons capable of Visible Church-membership. 2. Albeit, in these expressions spoken of the Gentiles, there be not definitely a restriction to some only (as M^r. Lockier would seem to insinuate that we say) yet the expressions are such as may be verified being understood of some only, and not of all and every one: because they are indefinite. Any Boy that hes learned the Rudiments of Logick knowes that there are enunciations particular, which speaks of some of a kind, definitely: and enunciations universal, which speaks of all and every one of a kind, definitely: and enunciations indefinite which in their form, speaks neither of some only, nor of all and every one of a kind definitely, but indefinitely of the kind: and that such indefinite enunciations, may be truly expounded, either particularly of some only, or universally, of all and every one, *pro ratione materiae contingentis vel necessarii*.

cessary, according as the nature of the things, contingent or necessary, leadeth us. But now, will the Author, upon serious deliberation, say that which he has uttered here, viz. that what the Apostle speaketh in the Text of the Gentiles, *indefinitely*, viz. *that they had purified their hearts by believing*, must be understood universally of all and every one of them that were turned to Christianity? Nay, I know he'll save the matter with his qualification, according to what Christian can discern of Christian, and so far as men, &c. But 1. This is an addition to the Text, whereof there is not the least insinuation in the Text. 2. Yea, the Text speaks clearly of such a purifying of hearts, as is in *veritate rei*, *sem objects*, i. e. indeed: because it speaks of it in relation to the knowledge and Judgement of God the searcher of hearts, whose Judgement is always according to Truth. But men esteemed to have hearts purified, in the charitable judgement of men let them be the most discerning men, may notwithstanding not have purified hearts indeed.

The Author, having done with what we have hitherto been considering, concludes and draws towards the Proposal of his Doctrine, thus; *Having thus painfully and plainly laid the foundation by the Word, and by a simple and sincere judgement thereupon, without the least respect to any party, or self-interest in the world, as he knoweth to whom in this, as in all my ways, I desire humbly to refer my self, I build thereupon this doctrine, &c. pag. 7.* To which, It may be humbly conceived that the Author might have spared to speak of his painfulness and plainness, &c. and suffered the deed to speak alone for itself, and other men to judge thereupon, remembering that, *Let another man praise thee, and not shine own mouth.* But to pass this, grant that there has been some painfulness in the preceding Discourse: yet if therein there has been plainly, or at all, by the Word of God, a foundation laid for the ensuing Doctrine, I submit to be judged by any impartial discerning man, upon consideration of what hath been answered.

Thus I have done with the first Section, wherein if I have been somewhat large, yet I desire and hope the Reader will pardon it, considering that the Discourse I have been examining is laid down as the foundation of the Doctrine following: and that, besides the Text, sundry other Scriptures brought in to make the Text speak for it, were to be considered.

SECT.

SECTION II.

Mr. Dockyers Doctrine pondered, and the State of the Controversie between Us and the INDEPENDENT BRETHREN, touching the necessary Qualification of Members of the VISIBLE CHURCH, cleared.

5. 1. **M**r. Lockiers determination, touching the matter of a Visible Church, is pag. 7. fine and pag. 8. propounded in these words: *The proper and allowed matter of a Visible Church, now in the dayes of the Gospel, is persons truly converted, such as God, who knoweth the hearts of all men, can bear witness of, as indeed sealed for his, by his Holy Spirit. (thus far he hath in a different Character, and then addeth, it would seem, by way of some explication) I say, this is the matter we ought now to take, to raise againe the Tabernacle of David, and none other, not one other, no not in a whole Church, so far as men truly converted, and very spiritual, are able to discern and judge.*
5. 2. First, I desire humbly to know of the Author, why he restricteth this Doctrine, touching this point, to the Visible Church, now in the dayes of the Gospel? For 1. I had ever thought it the received Doctrine of all Orthodox Reformed Divines, that the Churches of the Old and of the New Test. are of one and the same nature, as to essentials; and that the difference between them standeth in accidentals only. 2. Why do many of his way bring Arguments for this his Tenet, touching the allowed matter of a Visible Church, from Passages of the Old Test. spoken in relation to the then Church? 3. If the Visible Church in the dayes of the Old Test. might have consisted of others, as allowed matter, then are described here (which his restriction manifesteth) i. e. of persons not truly converted, &c. then, to borrow his Arguments brought afterward. 1. Either Christ was not the Rock and foundation of that Church, and that Church not a building being and bearing upon him, as a superstruction: or else then there might have been no Symmetrie, but Antilogie and Antistatie; no agreement, but a fighting of the materials of the building with the

the foundation, and one with another: and yet the building might stand well enough, such incongruous superstructions, and unsuitable to the foundation, were good enough then. 2. Either that Church was not the Church of the living God, such as in which God lives, dwells and walks: or then God did live and dwell in dead persons, who only make a Profession of Religion: and then, either the Church was not a pillar and ground to bear up truth unto the world: or dead persons, who only made a Profession of Religion, might have done that office well enough. 3. Then either in the Church of God there was none, at least there might have been a true Church offering, and yet no *pure offering*, no offering spiritual: or then a pure offering, *i. e.* service spirituall, holy and acceptable unto God, might have been offered by persons who only did profess Religion, were dead stones, having nothing of spirituality in them, but meer formality: and so hypocriticall, and amongst the number of them that are most abominable. Let the Author, if he hold that difference, intimated in his restriction, between the Churches of the Old and New Testam. extricate himself of these things: which, I am much deceived, if he shall be able to do, unlesse either he retract his restriction, or otherwise shoar upon some Socinian and Anabaptistick Fancy concerning the ancient Church.

Secondly, Let it be marked here, that Mr. Lockier clearly asserteth that the necessary and essentiall qualification, absolutely requisite to constitute persons, matter, or in a capacity to be Members of a Visible Church, is true saving Grace known to God the searcher of hearts: and that is such grace in the *verity of the thing*, and not only in the judgment of charity. Others in the Independent way, have spoken more warily in this matter; though indeed I confesse I do not see how, considering their prosecution of the point and the Arguments they use in it, they do not run into this same in the issue. However, it may hence appear, it was not for nought that the Author said in his Epistle to the Reader, *That he has spoken with more plain dealing then some other of his Brethren who have wrote of this Subject.* S. 3.

But haply it may be said that he explaineth himself in the next words, *viz. so far as men converted are able to discern and judge,* Which seemeth to import a resolving of the matter into the judgement S. 4.

ment of charity. *Ans.* This seemeth not sufficiently to save the mater, for this additament seemeth to be brought in rather to expresse the mean whereby persons so qualified as is said before (*viz. truly converted, &c.*) are to be found out; then to expresse any thing in the objective qualification of the mater of a visible Church. And certainly the Arguments brought afterward by the Author to confirm his Thesis, speak all for men godly in the truth of the thing, as will appear when we come at them.

- §. 5. The third thing I would have marked in the Authors proposall of his Doctrine, is this, that the judges by whose estimation men are to passe as the qualified mater of a Visible Church, are by him determined to be *men truly converted and very spirituall*. All Writers of the Independent way, have not, I confesse, come to my hand: but of these I have seen, I remember of none that saith this much: so that it seemeth to be a new conception of his own, touching which I humbly desire satisfaction in these particulars.
1. By this, when a person desireth to be admitted a member of a Church, it followeth that his qualification is to be judged, not by the estimation of the whole Church, but of some speciall members thereof: which is point-blank contrary to the Independent way of Government. The consequence I prove, 1. thus: Either it must be said that all and every one of the Church are truly converted *de facto*: or if that be not said, this which we have said doth unavoidably follow: but the former will not be undertaken by the Author; because it is point-blank contrary to plain Scripture, telling us that many are called but few chosen: and this is confessed by such as are most peremptory for his way of Church constituti-

*Barrow on * *Objection.* Ay, but all are true Converts in the judgment of charity. *Ans.* Such explanation is not mentioned or hinted of by the Author when he speaketh to this point of the Judges, by whose estimation Church-mater is to passe. 2. I prove the consequence thus: Mr. Lockier speaketh of such men to be Judges, as are not only truly converted, but also *very spirituall*. Now very spirituall importeth, I conceive, in plain English, if not a superlative degree, yet certainly somewhat above the meer positive; to be very spirituall, is more, yea much more then simply to be really and truly spirituall: So that either he must of necessity say that

*Barrow on *
discov. false
Church, p.
20. *Ans.*
mens.

that a Visible Church must consist of such only, who are not only, simply true converts; but also much more, far advanced Christians; and so new born Babes, bruised reeds, and smoking flax, must be held out, crushed, and quenched; or that which we said must follow. Now I suppose yet further that most part of the Congregation be spirituall, but in the *positive degree*, and onely two or three, or a few number in comparison, be *very spirituall* (certainly this may be by our Brethrens way of constituting a Church: for they grant such as have any thing, the least thing in truth of Christ appearing in them, are not to be excluded) then the resolution and judging of the whole businesse, must be devolved upon these few. Nay I must presse it yet further: Albeit it may be granted that when a Church is now complearely constitute in its integrality, and organized with all its members, it cannot be well supposed, but there will be therein some such men, *very spirituall*; at least Rulers; whom if so be they had not of themselves, while they were yet a gathering, yet it may well be supposed, that while they are yet a gathering, all of them are but spirituall in the *positive degree*. For what hinders, but such a company of persons may come together to gather into a Church? Now, I pray, what shall be done in this case, if Church-matter in point of fitness must passe by the estimation of men, more then positive in spiritualitie? Must it be said in such a case that though they be all satisfied in conscience concerning the truth of one anothers conversion, Yet they are not fit matter to make themselves a Church? I would see semblance or shadow of reason for this. Yea it appeareth contrary to sound reason, because in homogeneous bodies (such as a Church is, by the Doctrine of our Brethren, in the instance and period we are now speaking to) what is sufficient to constitute a part, is sufficient also to constitute the whole. Therefore if Conversion and spiritualnesse in the *positive degree*, be sufficient for one member of the Visible Church, its sufficient also for the whole, I mean, considered yet as *corum homogeneum*. The Author would do well to assay a clearing and extricating of these things upon his Principles.

The fourth thing to be considered is, that the Author hath chosen an ambiguous term to be the *subject* of his *thesis*, not distinguishing nor shewing in what sense he takes it (which is not a little

fault in determining contraverted points) while as he speaks thus, *allowed mater of the Visible Church*: For mater of a Visible Church may be said to be allowed in a double sense or relation, *viz.* either in regard of what is incumbent to a man himself by way of duty before God: or in regard of what is requisite in him by way of qualification in the outward Ecclesiastick Court, whereupon the Church may and ought to proceed in admitting him to the external communion of the Church. I confesse that none are mater of a Visible Church *allowed* in the former sense or relation, but such as are (not only so far as men most spirituall can discern or judge, but also) in very deed true converts and beleivers. Its a mans duty in professing Christianity and adjoyning himself to the Church of Christ, to beleve with his heart as he professeth with his mouth; otherwise he is matter not approven, not allowed of God. But I beleve its another thing to enquire what is mater of the Visible Church *allowed* in the latter sense: and thinks that advised men among our Brethren of the Independent way will say the same in the generall. Yet I trow it shall be found afterward that the strength and stream of our Authors Arguments, runs in the former; and so are little to the purpose of the Controversie between us and our Brethren, touching the mater of the Visible Church.

- S. 7. To make way for a more clear discovery of this, and to the effect we may in the whole ensuing disput know what we are doing, and not fight in the dark *Andabatarum more*, it is necessary before we proceed further to open up and bound the state of the controversie, which Mr. Lockier lies not done. I cannot tell upon what intention, or if upon any design at all, and not rather out of pure neglect; or some other such thing. If he say he was Preaching to people, and not Disputing in the Schoole; and that therefore it was not needfull, nor becoming, Scholastically to state a controversie. I Answ. Whether in Pulpit or Schoole, his purpose was to draw his hearers of this Nation from a Doctrine which they had learned and professed before the world; to a new way. Sure, ingenuous dealing would have required that the Doctrine of this Church, which he intended to refute, and to take them off, should been, once at least, plainly and simply propounded and presented before.

before them. This he doth not all along, but in effect speaks so *indirectly*, as if we allowed all meer professors whatsoever, to be members of the Visible Church. Well, what he has not done, we shall endeavour according to our weaknesse to do: and shall deal more liberally with his side, then he has done with ours. Now then let these considerations be premised.

1. Let it be considered that this controversy is not about the §. 8.
Members of the Mystical, Invisible Church, or of the Church according to its inward state: but of the Members of the Visible Church, *as such*; or of the Church according to its external state. The Church Mystical, Invisible, or according to its inward state is the Societie of men effectually called unto saving communion with Christ, to which doth belong, in the intention and purpose of God, all the promises of spirituall blessings pertaining to life and salvation. The Church Visible and considered according to its externall state, is the Societie of men professing true Christian faith and Religion, for communion in the outward exercises of the Worship and Ordinances of God: Admission of members into the Church Invisible is the work of God by the operation of the Spirit in Effectuall Calling and ingrafting men into Christ. Admission of members into the Church Visible, and according to its externall state is committed to the Pastors and Rulers of the Church, who being men, and so not seeing the inward constitution and condition of hearts, must look at things obvious to the senses, in their administration of this work. Whence, one may be *orderly and lawfully* admitted a member of the Church Visible, who is not a member of the Church Invisible: And about this our adversaries, I conceive, at least such as are most sound and intelligent amongst them, will make no controversy. Further, it is to be observed that the question and controversy between us and the Independent Brethren, much differs from that which is debated between the Papists and the orthodox concerning Church-members. The state of the controversy with Papists, which they, and namely *Bellarmino*, involve with many Sophismes, is truly and really this: (as the judicious *Ames* has well observed, *Bellar. Enerv. lib. 2. de Ecclesia cap. 1. thes. 10.* others have not so well considered) whether the whole multitude of professors, comprehending as

well unregenerate hypocrites and reprobats, as true elect believers, be that Church of Christ to which properly doth belong all these excellent things, spoken of the Church in Scripture, *viz.* that it is redeemed by Christ, the Body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ, quickened, acted and led by the Holy Spirit, partakers of all the spirituall blessings, so that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Albeit Papists dare not state the question in these terms; yet the affirmative thereof is the thing they intend, that they might obtain a Catholick Visible Church at all times illustriously visible, infallible, and unfaillable; and that there Romane is it. But it is a far other matter that is debated between us and our present adversaries, *viz.* what persons are to be admitted and accounted to belong to the Church Visible, according to its outward state. So that these, who shall make use of Arguments used by Orthodox Writers, in shewing that not wicked, hypocrites and reprobates, but only the elect true beleivers are members of Christs Church, against us for affirming that all who outwardly do seriously professe the Christian faith are to be admitted, and accounted members of the Visible Church: they are clearly in a great mistake and impertinency.

*5.9. 2. Consider, we are to distinguish Visible Church-membership *in actu primo*, and *in actu secundo*. I must crave leave to use these terms, and shall explain what I mean by them. By the *actus primus* of Church-membership, I mean such a state and condition of a person as makes that now he is not to be reckoned and looked upon by the Church, Pastors or Professours as *extraneus* i. e. without, but *intra*, not as a stranger and alien, but as a Brother, 1 Cor. 5. 11, 12. And consequently may and ought to be overseen, cared for, and fed by the Pastours and Rulers of the Church, as a part of the flock, and by private professors dealt with in duties of Christian fellowship according to their and his capacitie. The *actus secundus* of Visible Church-membership, is *χρησις & fructio*, i. e. the fruition and actuall use of Church priviledges, ordinance, and acts of outward Christian fellowship: This distinction is of necessary consideration in this controversie. For it is certain, one may be actually a member of the Visible Church *in actu primo*, and yet not actually enjoy the use and exercise of all and every Church priviledge

wiledge and ordinance, whereunto Church-membership gives him a right *in habitu*: Because unto the fruition of the actuall exercise of some priviledge and ordinance there may be required an especiall condition, which may be a man wanteth through some physicall incapacitie, or some morall defect. As under the Old Testament, persons that were undoubted members of the visible Church of Israel; yet might for some legall pollution, as an issue of blood, touching of a dead body, &c. been debarred from the publick Assemblies of the Church and Sacrifices for a time, untill they were cleansed from the pollution according to order instituted by God: So also one who is an acknowledged member of the Visible Church, being overtaken with a scandalous fault, and not carrying himself obstinately, but submitting himself, may be kept from the actuall exercise and use of some Ordinances, untill the scandall be sufficiently removed, yet still, as is acknowledged on all hands, continue a Church-member *in actu primo*; and it hath been constantly held by Orthodox Divines, untill Anabaptists arose, that Children under the Old Test. being born in the Church, were then, and now being born in the Christian Church are, even while under the years of discretion, members of the Visible Church. Although neither then they were, nor now are capable of actuall use and exercise of all Church-priviledges and Ordinances. Therefore it is one thing to enquire what is requisite to constitute one capable of Church-membership *simpliciter* and *in actu primo*; and another to enquire what is requisite to make one immediatly capable of actuall use and exercise of all and every Church-priviledge and Ordinance whereunto Church-membership doth entitle him.

3. Consider: we must difference between that which is required SECT. II. of a man, by way of *duty in foro Dei*, that he may adjoyn himself unto Church-communion, and participate Ordinances in such a manner as is necessary for his own salvation, and approving himself to God: and that which is required of him by way of *qualification in foro Ecclesiastico*, that the Church may lawfully and orderly admit him to their externall communion, and thereafter respect, account, and deal with him as *is loit iow i. e.* amongst these that are within. The reason of this distinction is clear, because the duty of a man that will so adjoyn himself into the communion of the Church

Church as is requisite for salvation, and for approving himself therein to God, doth, no doubt, reach formally and directly the inward man, the frame and acting thereof: But the qualification requisite in the Ecclesiastick Court whereupon the Church is to proceed in admitting or acknowledging men Church-members, doth consist (formally and directly, at least) only in somewhat outward and apparent to men: For it is a sure rule, *de occultis non indicat Ecclesia*, as is confessed by *Hooker, Survey, Part. 1. c. 2. pag. 15.* speaking of the same purpose, and by *Mr. Lockier* himself, *pag. 55.*

S. II.

4. Consider: There is an holiness *relative* or *adherent*, and an holiness *absolute* and *inherent*. The holiness *relative* and *adherent* consisteth in the separation of a thing from a common use, and dedication of it unto some holy use or end. Holiness *absolute* or *inherent* consisteth in qualities or actions of a person agreeable to the Law of GOD. In the former way, the stones of which the Temple was built are called stones of holiness, *Lam. 4. 1.* So the Temple it self, the Vessels consecrated to the Worship of God, the City of *Jerusalem*, are called holy. In like manner persons in a speciall way set apart for the Worship of God, as the Priests and Levites, and especially the High Priest, are called holy. In like manner the whole People of Israel are said to be holy, *Deut. 33.* and to be sanctified by God, *Exod. 31. 13. Lev. 8. 8. and 21. 8. and 22. 32.* Because, to wit, God by entering in Covenant with them, had separated them from other people, and Adopted them to be a peculiar People for himself: in the same sense, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* The Children born of one Parent at least a beleever, i. e. a Professour of Christian Religion are called holy, because they are comprehended in the Covenant made with, and embraced by the Parents for themselves and theirs: and so are to be esteemed as among Christians separated from prophane people, and dedicated to God.

Again, holiness is either *inward and true*, which consisteth in the inward renovation of the soul, faith, hope, love and other supernaturall habites and their elicit acts: Or *externall*, which consisteth in the Profession of the true and Orthodox Religion, and a conversation, so far as comes under mens knowledge, ordered according to the rule of Gods Commands, as is competent to humane

weaknesse,

weaknesse, *i. e.* without scandal, at least, contumacy and obstinacy in some given scandal, and comprehendeth also in it that holiness *relative* and of *dedication*. Further it is worthy diligent observation here, that when it is said the Church is a societie of *visible saints*, this may be understood in a double sense; for the Epithete [*visible*] may either be taken as a note signifying not the nature of the form which gives the denomination of Saints or holy: but an adjunct thereof, *viz.* the *notoriety* and manifestation of it before men. In which sense if it be taken in that description, visible Saints are such as by outward, manifest and evident signes and tokens are perceived and acknowledged to be endued with true inward holiness, and grace of regeneration. Or it may be taken as a note signifying the very nature and kind of the form, *i. e.* holiness which giveth that denomination. In which sense if it may be taken, then men are said to be visible Saints, in so far as they are adorned with externall holiness, although abstract from that internall and true grace of regeneration.

The state of the Controversie then lyeth in this, to expresse it as §. 12. plainly as I may, what is requisite in a person as the necessary qualification in the *Ecclesiastick Court*, whereupon he is to be received or acknowledged as a member of the Visible Church, and is to be accounted as not *in solis*, *i. e.* among these that are without, but *in solis*, *i. e.* among those that are within, and so over whom the Pastors and Rulers of the Church should watch, and care to feed him by the Ordinantes of Christ according to his capacity, and to whom private Christians ought to perform duties of Christian communion according to their stations? *viz.* whether reall, internall grace of regeneration, repentance toward God, and faith in Jesus Christ: at least such evident signs thereof, manifested and approved upon accurate examination and triall, as is a sufficient ground whereupon the Church may and ought to esteem and judge the person truly gracious, regenerate and endued with true saving faith and repentance; in a word, a true inward Saint, or if somewhat else.

As for the Tenet of the Independent Brethren, all of them speak §. 13. not the same way. Mr. Hooker, *Survey part. 1. c. 2. pag. 20, 21.* confesseth that the expressions of some of his Brethren, as well as

those of the Separation, are somewhat narrow at the first sight, and seem to require exactnesse of the highest strain, and so speaks for a candid interpretation of them, to wit, that when such Phrases of theirs occurre upon this Subject, as these: *Only the Saints, faithfull, called and sanctified*, are to be members of the Congregation: such a construction as this be put upon these words: persons visibly, externally such to the judgement of charity, not alwayes really and internally such, by the powerfull impression of Gods free grace. Certainly some of them have so roundly affirmed that none should be acknowledged members of the visible Church, but such as are true internall Saints, that hardly can such a construction be put upon their words. See D. Holmes and Mr. Barcleys expressions set down by Daniel Cawdry in his Schem of contradictions in the Independent way, n. 17. Add Mr. Lockers expressions of this purpose along his Lecture can as hardly suffer such a construction. Others of them indeed have spoken more warily and in a lower strain, as Mr. Hooker himself, stating the Question, p. 1. pag. 15. tells us persons who may be are hypocrites inwardly; yet if their conversations and expressions be such, that we cannot but conclude in charity, there may be and is some spirituall good in them, we say and hope, and are bound to conceive they are Saints; these are fit mater of a Visible Church. Only it is to be observed

*By a positive judgement, wee mean the eliciting of an act of the understanding, whereby we affirme the man to be such: and by a negative judgement, the abstaining from affirmation of the contrary.

that it cannot be well discerned by his words, whether he meaneth a *negative judgement of charity, or a positive: his words, as to this, are so wavering and fluctuating, and that very remarkably, pag. 14. end, and 15. begin. he speaketh of the mater thus: *So far as rationall charity directed by rule from the Word, a man can not but conclude that there may be some seeds of some spiritual work of grace in the heart.* Here if we look at these words, *A man can not but conclude*, one would think that a positive judgement were intended: for that expression doth import a necessity of eliciting positively an act of judgement affirming of the subject, that form touching which the Question is. But the next word which is but *a may be* (nothing being more said there; before he concludeth the description of Visible Saints) seemeth to cast down that and to import lesse. Then a little after he expresseth clearly a positive judgement: *we say and hope, and are bound to conceive they are*

Saints.

Saints. Again in propounding the state of the Question, the matter is involved in a cloud: *We cannot conclude but in charity there may be and is some spirituall good in them, &c.* If we look at that, *we cannot conclude but, &c.* one would think only a negative judgement were intended: for these words import no more but a necessity of abstaining from an act of judgment, whereby the form in Question is denied of the subject, or the contrair thereunto affirmed. But when it is added, *there may be and is, &c.* this seems to speak for a positive. Before it was, *we cannot but conclude*; and therewith, *there may be, only.* Now it is, *we cannot conclude but*: and herewith *there may be and is.* I verily think the godly man has been at a puzzle in his conceptions about the matter. Of all the Brethren of the Independent way, whose Writings I have had occasion to see, Mr. Norton in his Answer to *Gulliel. Apoll.* his Questions are most moderate, and come nearest to the truth. In many particulars he cometh below that which is required by most part of all others of that way, particularly in that expressly he asserteth that it is not a positive judgement, but only negative, that we are to have of the grace of Church-members, c. 3. that we are not positively to judge ill of them.

But not to insist on these differences: this in generall is their common Tenet, that only such can be taken to be members of the Visible Church, whether as foundationalls at the first gathering of the Church, or as additionalls by admission into fellowship of the Church; as may and ought to be accompted in the judgement of charity true heart-beleivers, having reall communion with Christ, and that upon sufficient evidences given thereof. 1. By knowledge in the Fundamentall points of Religion, and such other as are requisite and necessary to be known for leading a life without scandal. 2. An experimentall work of Grace upon their hearts, of Repentance towards God, and Faith in the LORD JESUS CHRIST. 3. A conversation, not only without scandall and offence before men (indeed Norton goeth no further) but also without neglect of any known duty, and commission of any known ill, concerning which they must be a good space tryed first in a way privat: if the Church be a gathering, by one another mutually, untill they be mutually satisfied in the judgement of charity touching the truth

of the grace of each other. If it be in the admission of additional members, the triall is first by the Ruling Elder or Elders, both by way of diligent enquiry, for information from others, and by way of conference with, and examination of the parties themselves. Then all things being clear and satisfactory to the Elder, the person being propounded to the Church, the people also must (as opportunity may serve them) try their spirituall condition, and that both wayes too. If these find no realitie of satisfaction, they present their dissatisfaction to the Elder or Elders, which stayes the proceeding for the present. But if satisfaction hath been gotten by Elders and People in this privat way, then the persons to be admitted must further (every one after another, if it be at the first gathering of the Church) make, first a publick confession of their knowledge and faith in the grounds of Religion: then a declaration of the experimentall work of their effectuall vocation. 1. In Repentance from dead works. 2. In their unfeigned faith towards the Lord Jesus: and then must produce, if required, a testimony of their blamelesse conversation. For a testimony to my faithfulness in this representation of their Doctrine, I refer the Reader to these on the Margent*.

* Hooker

Survey. p. 1.

c. 2. pag. 14.

15, 24, 25.

p. 3. cap. 3.

pag. 4. r.

Brief Nar-

rat. of the

pract. of the

Churches

of N.E. pa.

1, 2, 3, 9.

Mr. Cotton

way. cap. 3.

sect. 2. pag.

54, 55, sect.

3. pag. 56,

57, 58.

S. 15.

is, that none are to be received members into externall fellowship of the Visible Church, but such as are already true heart-converts indued with saving grace, and having reall internall fellowship with Christ, in the judgement of charity grounded upon such triall and evidences, as we have heard.

As for our judgement in the controversie (I mean of the Church of Scotland at which the adversaries, especially this with whom we have to do, mainly hath an eye. Albeit we know no Protestant Church in the world, differing from us in this, but the Independents) scarcely shall you find any of our adversaries directly make a proposall of it what it is: but for the most part, as they give intimations thereof here and there, would bear men in hand that we do allow any whosoever professe the Christian faith, although their lives and conversations were never so wicked and prophane, to be fit matter and members of the Visible Church. Which is, I must say, much want of ingenuitie in them, and great injurie done to us, as will appear shortly. So Mr. Lockier along this Peece in-

● intimating

terminating our Doctrine speaks alwayes of persons *meerly* professing the things of God. But I wonder much how that did fall from the Pen of Reverend Mr. Hooker, speaking of our judgement, Surv. p. 1. c. 2. pag. 20. *The pinch of the difference lyeth in this, whether such as walk in a way of prophanesse, or remain pertinaciously obstinate in some wickednesse, though otherwayes professing and practising the things of the Gospel, have any allowance from Christ, or may be accounted fit mater to constitute a Church: this is that which is controverted and should have been evitted by Argument, he is speaking to Mr. Rutherford. Good Mr. Hooker, where did you ever read such an assertion as this in Mr. Rutherford, or any of ours? I need not stay upon vindicating Mr. Rutherford in this: he will do it ere long himself. I shall only plainly propound our Judgement upon the Question, in these two Conclusions.*

1. *Conclus.* True, heart conversion, regeneration, sanctification, inward saving grace in reality of existence, or conceived at heart, to be in the judgement of charitie, is not requisite as the qualification necessary, in the *Ecclesiastick Court*, in order to admitting persons to be members of the Visible Church. Or thus, to the same purpose, it is not necessary nor requisite, to the effect, that persons be accounted fit mater of the Visible Church, that they be such as upon tryall and approven evidences, may and ought to be conceived, in the judgement of charity, by the Church, already inwardly regenerate, sanctified, taken into reall fellowship with Christ. And therefore we judge it altogether unwarrantable to put such as are desirous of the externall fellowship of the Visible Church, to such tryalls touching the work of saving grace in their hearts, in order to admitting into Church-fellowship, and as antecedently necessary thereunto, as is taught and practised by Independents, and set down summarly here a little before.

2. *Conclus.* A serious, sober outward profession of the faith, and true Christian Religion, together with a serious profession of forsaking former sinfull courses, (if the person be one coming out of heathenisme or some false Religion) or an outward conversation free of scandall, at least, accompanied with obstinacy (if he hath been a Christian in Profession before) and a serious Profession of subjection unto the Ordinances of Christ: A *serious profession* of these

these things, I say, as such, considered abstractly (*abstractiōes simplici*) from the work of inward saving grace and heart-conversion by true Repentance and Faith, is sufficient qualification in the Ecclesiastick Court to constitute a person fit mater to be received as a member of the Visible Church, and accounted *in laicis* i. e. amongst these that are within. If it be asked what I mean by a *serious* profession? I *Ans.* Such a profession as hath in it at least a *moral sincerity* (as practick Divines are wont to distinguish) tho haply not alwayes a *supernaturall* sinceritie, i. e. (that I may speak more plainly) which is not openly and discernably simulate, histrionick, scenicall, and hypocriticall in that hypocrisie which is grosse: but all circumstances being considered, by which ingenuity is. estimate amongst men, giving credit one to another, there appears no reason why the man may not and ought not to be esteemed, as to the mater, to think and purpose as he speaketh from whatsoever habituall principle it proceedeth, whether, *viz.* of saving grace and faith, or of faith historicall, and conviction wrought by some common operation of the Spirit. A man that hath such a profession as this and desireth Church-communion, I say, the Church ought to receive him as a member. And albeit I deny not but where there is just or probable ground of suspicion that the profession hath simulation and fraudulent dealing under it, as in one new come from a hereticall Religion, or who has been before a persecutor of the faith and professors thereof; there may be a delay in prudencie and time taken to try and prove if he dealeth seriously and ingenuously: but that tryall must not be to cognosce upon the truth of the work of saving grace in the heart. Pastours indeed ought wisely and diligently try and acquaint themselves, as far as they can, with the spirituall state of all the members of their flock, that they may the better know to divide the Word of God aright, giving to every one their suitable portion, that beginners may be promoted in the grace of Christ, and such as are yet in a naturall state may be awakened to flee from the wrath to come. But I utterly deny that such a tryall of persons touching the truth of the work of grace in their hearts is antecedently and in order to their admission necessary, and in duty incumbent to the Church that is to admit them.

Having

Having thus stated the Question, and bounded the differences §. 18. about it; it would follow that we should in the next place bring Arguments to confirm what we hold for truth, and to refute the contrary. Which method we would have followed were we not upon the examination of a particular Piece of an adversary, whose method we resolve to trace step for step. Therefore proceeds now to consider his Arguments what force they have to confirm his, or infringe our Doctrine. Afterward having considered what Objections he brings against himself as ours, and his answers to the same, we shall adde some such other Arguments as may be satisfactory to Readers, and the Author may, if he think fit, take to his consideration.

SECTION III.

Mr. Lockyers first Classe of Arguments, viz. Texts of SCRIPTURE, Act. 9. 26. Act. 2. 47. Heb. 3. 5, 6. brought as directly holding forth his Doctrine, answered.

His Arguments are of four Classes. 1. Some Texts of Scripture §. 19. as directly holding forth his Doctrine. 2. Some others holding forth hints and shadows of it. 3. An induction of instances of particular Churches, mentioned in Scripture, as so constitute. 4. Some reasons. We shall take them into consideration in so many Sections according to their order in the Author.

To his Texts of Scripture he is pleased to preface with this confident expression. *That ye may know how richly the Scripture consents to this:* To which we say no more but that, it is most sureable to sound a triumph after the victory: And so comes to his first Text, Acts 9. 26. *And when Saul was come to Jerusalem he assayed to joyn himself to the Disciples, but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a Disciple.* On which place, he, for effecting his purpose from it, commenteth thus: First in a parenthesis, he supposeth that the Disciples carriage here towards Paul proceeded from light and conscience, and tendernesse in this matter, viz. of admitting members into their Visible Church-communion:

nion: and makes a note upon that particle *all*, that they were a homogeneous body under the same light, &c. in the matter. Then addeth, *What did they fear?* That he did not make profession of Christianity? *Why, now he rendered himself to do it: Why should they have denyed him now if bare profession had been enough?* It is evident they feared that he did but merely profess, and that they should take in an heterogeneous pece; one that had but the outside of that qualification which this new building should have; and therefore Barnabas took him to the Apostles, and declared to them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and used all means to satisfy them of the reality of Gods work upon his heart. And upon this he was received as fit matter for this new house, and as suitable matter to that which was already in the building.

- S. 3. *Ans.* 'Tis a wonder to me, and I profess I cannot wonder enough that any judicious and learned of the Independent Brethren should ever alledged this place for their Tenet in this Question: yet not only our Author here, but others also before him, have brought it to that purpose. But I have observed it a thing incident even to good men, and in other things discerning, that when they have once taken up an opinion in a matter of Religion, and it has gotten rooting in them, they become so fond in love with their own conception, that either readily they will even bend their wits to straine and force Scripture to speak for it; or else their judgement being somewhat vitiate, as to that particular, with affection, trowes any word almost speaks clear for it. How others of them have improven this place, I stay not to consider: but to what Mr. Lockier lies on it. 1. He supposeth that the matter between Paul and the Disciples at Jerusalem, was about admission of him to be stated a member of that Visible Church. Now where appeareth that in the Text? You'll say there *he essayed to joyn himself to the Disciples*: good enough, forsooth, to please credulous and unstable minds. The simple meaning of the words is no other thing but that he assayed to be familiarly with them. So the word *κοινωνῶ* is used afterward, c. 10. v. 28. *Ye know that it is unlawful for a man that is a Jew κοινωνῶν* i. e. to keep company or familiarly converse with, or come unto one of another nation. 'Tis of the same sense with *συνχρησθαι* Joh. 4. 9. But besides this, I think upon

upon this supposition made by Mr. Lector, and other Followers of him was concerning the Visible Church, he may be put to a long question. But when as it is held by our Divines, that there is no Visible Church existing, but a particular Congregation; I would ask whether Paul had been a Visible Church member before this time any other where? And if so, whether he did now cease to be a Visible member of that former Church, and so of all Churches, by suiting to be a member of the Church at Jerusalem, until he was received in there? Then when he removed again from Jerusalem, whether he laid down his membership in that Church? Or if he continued standing in it, when he was travelling through the world? Then if he laid it down, whether he believed to be rated a member in another Visible Church, and thus in another, according as he removed from one place to another? 2. Whether the Author layes that the Disciples at Jerusalem their dislike toward Paul was from light, and conscience, and tenderness in the matter of the constitution of the Visible Church, and that they did fear they should enter a heterogeneous piece, is evidently held forth before the Text? And he must give us leave to doubt if he spoke that in good bad earnest, can any man conceive any other thing to be meant by these words, *they all feared him*, but this: that when as he had before been a violent persecutor of Christians, they apprehended he was still such an one, and might be now only looking to intimate himself amongst them as a Wolfe to destroy them. That they feared him the same way that a *Pharisee* did, v. 14. 15. of this same Chap. Will any man say, that reads the Story when he comes to this Passage, conceive other ways of the meaning thereof? May, I appeal to the Authors own conscience, if upon serious looking again upon the words and the series of the Story, himself can conceive otherwise of it. Now such a fear as this, and that light, conscience, and tenderness in the matter of Church constitution are very different things. As for his Argumentative questioning, *Will they fear? That he did not make a Profession of Christianity? Why, now he tendered himself as do so,* — how is it evident that they feared he did not merely profess, &c. I. *Ans.* 'Tis very poor and unbecoming a man of understanding

pretending to speak seriously: I say, that was not it they feared, that he did not make Profession of Christianity: nor yet that that he did but merely profess, taking mere Profession only in opposition to Profession from a Principle of saving grace: but the thing they feared was his cruelty, which they had seen before not knowing but he was still on that same way: and they feared his professing himself a Disciple, and assaying to converse familiarly with them, was but fraudulent countenance to get advantage to execute his cruelty. And *Barnabas* at his bringing him to the Apostles, and his discourse touching the Lords dealing with him (wherein I confesse there is so much, as might sway their judgements to account him not only one seriously and *sine dolo malo* Professing Christianity: but also a truly gracious convert, yea, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ) was to take this fear out of their hearts, that they might without apprehension of danger converse with him. And accordingly when the effect of *Barnabas* discourse and information is set down, *v. 28.* we find not a word nor a hint of an Ecclesiastick admission, or stating him into Church-membership: But this is said, *he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem.* i.e. he was daily conversing familiarly with them. I need say no more to this Passage, but shall only add this: Godly men would be more tender of Scripture then to use or rather to abuse it thus; by shaping conceptions of their own, and then driving them into it by force. Come we to the next Text.

§ 4. It is *Act. 2. 47.* And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved, *eos qui salvi fiebant* (so he translateth it) but what hence to his purpose? He added to the Church the *favens* those which were out of harms-way, as we say, in a safe and sure state, and so are no persons, but such who have received the sure mercies of David. A sinner is not safe nor out of Gun-shot till indeed in Christ. And this is the matter accepted and taken in to build withall, and none else so far as they could make judgement between things that differed. After this he concludes by a dilemma (thus: Either they were thus strict upon their own will and so not to be followed: Or else by divine and infallible warrant; and so as a precedent which hath the force of a precept. And then takes occasion.

occasion to anticipate an Objection thus: *And this is over and above a plain demonstration of the possibility of the present being obeyed, which taketh off that Objection, Iwerd well, Sir, say you? But how can it be? How shall we do it? Why, it hath been so, therefore may be; therefore should be, and no other wise.*

Answer. Here are involved a number of things, some *gratia* affirmed, some evidently false. 1. He supposeth all these *conquies*, were already and antecedently to their addition to the Church, inwardly delivered and transfused from the state of nature and sin into the state of grace, and began seal union by faith in Christ and this he grounds upon the Greek participle, which he will have translated *the saved* as noting a thing then already done. But this is a very weak ground to beat up that supposition. Why, who knoweth not that oftentimes in the Greek Language, passive participles of the present tense are used in the signification of gerundive names: So that [*conquies*] may be well rendered *servando*, such as were to be saved. And so hath *Beza* and the old Latine Interpreters rendered it, *qui salvi fierent*, and the English Translation, *such as should be saved*; and so the word doth not necessarily import; as the Author would have it, that these added were, antecedently to their addition, *saved* by the begun work of grace in them (tho we are not denying but it might been so with them) and that under that consideration, and upon that account they were added. But this it doth import, that they were such as God by the decree of Election had appointed to be saved, and that he added them to the Church as the means whereby they were to be actually made partakers of Salvation, as *Calvine* well taketh it up. 'Tis true, the Syriack Interpreter, as expounded by *Tremel.* hath it, *qui salvi stabant*, but withall he hath the whole place thus, *addemas quosdam eos qui salvi stabant in Ecclesia, i. e.* such as were lived in the Church. 2. He supposeth that this Text speaketh of Ecclesiastick addition of members, *in foro exteriori*, in the outward Court, by the Church Rulers, or them, and the Congregation together (to which of these belongeth this Act, we dispute not now) upon outward tryall and discerning. This again is besides the Text, which speaketh not one word of this; I mean, the

Churches

Churches adding or admitting; but of Gods adding; which Interpretation expound of the work of saving grace upon their hearts, converting and drawing them effectually to Christ and distinguishing them from the acts of the outward Ministry upon them. See Calvin, in locum most plaine the words of Eras. Savarin in *Ator. Ioran. dixi Dominum non addidisse Ecclesia quos salvi fierent; perinde enim est de si diceret Lucas, quos non addidit Deus, etiam si se ipsi addiderit Ecclesia, non tamen fuerunt salvi.* So Mr. Lockiers dilemma falls to the ground, having no ground in the Text to subsist on. It supposeth the Text to be speaking of an Ecclesiastick procedure with persons, upon outward call and discerning; when as the Text is speaking of no such thing, but of a divine efficiency upon persons. 3. He supposeth that all and every one that were then visibly added to the Church, and none else were added but such as were transfused to the state of grace, partakers of the free mercies of David; really in Christ at least so far as they could make judgement between things that differed. But first, I ask where doth he find, or how will he make out of the Text that Interpretation, *so far as they could make judgement*, &c. and that the word *etiam*, must not be understood without any such qualification, so import such as were really saved. I think this, in divine designation, is that indeed is meant, and he shall never instruct from the Text that which he saith. 4. How will he make out from the Text, that all and every one that were by Ecclesiastick admission added to the Church, and none else? The Text indeed saith, *the Lord added such as were so to be saved*, &c. Doth it hence follow, none else were by Ecclesiastick admission added to the Church? The Author must give us leave not to believe every thing upon his bare Assertion, and must finde out new Logick ere he prove that consequence; so then we see not how this Scripture consenteth to this point of Doctrine: the simple meaning of the words being this, namely, that daily the Lord was by his effectual assisting the Ministry of the Gospel, and working upon the hearts of men, bringing such as he had a purpose to save into the fellowship of the Church: that these in, as the ordinary way instituted by himself, they might be led on to the participation of eternall salvation. But this no

wayes

wayes importeth, but many others not so destinate to salvation, might adjoin themselves, and be by Ecclesiastick admission received into the outward fellowship of the Church.

The 3^d. Text is Heb. 3. 5, 6. *And Moses verily was faithfull 5. 6. in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things that were to be spoken after: but Christ as a Sonne over his own house whose house are we, if we hold fast our confidence, and rejoycing of hope firm unto the end.* Hereupon the Author commeth thus: *To a Church of the Jews this is spoken, who did apostatize much, and so forsook their assemblies, and so their exhorting one another with all these means of grace and life, which God hath instituted in this new house: and so indeed grew worse and worse, till at last they came as the rest of the Jewish Churches, to nothing. As long, saith the Apostle, as ye hold fast the practice and power of what you profess, so long you are a Church: but when you let go this, you unchurch your selves, and should it be pursued upon you, you should be thrown out as unhalloved water: but if others, which should do it, will not do it, the Master himself, who is faithfull, will do it. He will cast such a Church wholly off, which thus suffer his institution to be corrupted: and so indeed he did write Loamun upon the first Churches, quickly after the Apostles time, for this thing.*

Ans. If this be not to force Scripture and make it speak what men please, I know not what else is. Let's first mark some groundlesse Assertions, and then we shall come to the main point of our Answer. 1. I wonder at that rash assertion in the close of this, and so indeed did he write Loamun upon the first Churches, quickly after the Apostles time, for this thing. What? and were the first Churches so soon casten off by God, as no Churches? What divine warrant is brought for this Assertion? Sit, produce the Bill of Divorcement given to them from the Lord. And was there never a Church since; untill they were erected of the new Independent frame and model? Were all the Christian Churches in Asia, Africk and Europe, in the times of the four famous Generall Councils (the first whereof was about three hundred years after the Apostles time) now no Churches at all? Here indeed look out the Donatists, *ubi eras in meridie*, especially if we'll consider upon what

account the Author unchurches them, because forsooth they admitted members into their fellowship which were not true Converts, partakers of the sure mercies of *David*, &c. this is very Doctrinism in grain. 2. The Author supposeth that the Apostle here is speaking to a Church of the Jews, i.e. to one particular Congregation, distinct from all the rest of the Jewish Churches. This is but a bare Assertion without any proof or semblance of proof joined with it. We know that some of the Learned Interpreters take this Epistle to have been written not to any particular Church or Congregation, but to the whole multitude of the Jews professing Christian Religion, scattered abroad through the world, as were the Epistles of *James* and *Peter*; and have for them an argument not improbable from that 2. Epist. of *Peter*, c. 3. v. 15. 'It is true that others think otherways upon consideration of what we read, *Heb.* 13. 19. where the divine Author desires them he writes to, to pray for him, that he might be restored the sooner to them, which seemeth to import a more limited compasse then the whole dispersion. But granting this that it was not written to all the Jews, why might it not be written to all the Christian Jew that were in *Palestina* and *Judaea*. Most part Interpreters take it so, but that it was written to one single Congregation of the Jews, as Mr. *Lockier* would have it, who will believe upon his bare word? 3. He seems to suppose a clear mixture of these to whom the Apostle speaketh, viz. that they did apostatize much, forsook their Assemblies, their mutuall exhorting with all the means of grace and life: Indeed the Apostle warneth them to take heed of these things, and speaks of some that did so; but as for them he writeth unto, he layeth no such thing to their charge as done by them, but giveth testimony to the contrair, c. 6. v. 9, 10. cap. 10. v. 32, 33, 34, 39. 4. The maine mistake & groundlesse supposition here is this, that when the Apostle saith, *whose house ye are if ye hold fast, &c.* he meaneth this of an outward Visible Church-state. So long saith he, as ye hold fast, &c. so long ye are a Church (he meaneth a stated Visible Church) but when you let go, &c. you un-Church your selves, &c. And so, as we see, will have the words to involve a threatening of losing that visible Church-state upon failing of performance of that which is urged, viz. holding fast the confidence, &c.

contrary

contrary to the current of all Orthodox Interpreters *, who
 expone that *whose house ye are*, of the state of grace and spirituall
 communion with Christ, proper to the Mysticall Invisible Church,
 in regard of which Christ dwells in the heart by faith: and conse-
 quently conceive not the context of the verse to import a turning
 of them out of one state which now they were in, into another es-
 tate, upon non-performance of that duty which is required. But
 to intimate that the non-performance thereof would discover that
 they were not in that state which they professed themselves, and
 seemed to others to be in. And I prove that it is to be interpreted
 thus, and not as Mr. Lockier will have it. The Apostle meaneth
 the same here, *whose house ye are*, &c. which he saith v. 14. *We*
are partakers of Christ if we hold fast the beginning of our confi-
dence, &c. So Interpreters agree that one and the same thing is
 said in both verses, and the very purpose it self evidenceth so much.
 But now is *partaking of Christ* nothing else but to be in a Visible
 Church state? Yea for confirmation let it be observed that the A-
 postle saith not *whose house ye are*, but *we are*, so that he speaks
 of some what under the metaphor of *house* which he supposeth
 common to him and them together. What was this? Visible
 Church-membership of a certain (we are not told where residing)
 particular congregation of Jewes? Mr. Lockier hes not heeded
 this, or has purposely passed it over. 5. There seemeth to me in
 Mr. Lockiers words here somewhat very like the Arminian apo-
 stacy of Saints, *while you hold fast* (saith he) *the practice and*
power of what you professe, and when you let it go, &c. is he in-
 deed of this judgement, that men may have the practice and power
 of godlinesse, and afterward lett it go? If he say, he meaneth of he neither
 such as have had it, so far as men could judge, &c. well, this qua-
 lification, if in any place, should have been mentioned here, where

small apostacy of the Saints, nor mindeth to weaken the confidence of Believers, more
 then he doubteth of his own perseverance, or mindeth to weaken his own faith,
 but relating to the number of the Visible Church, he putteth a difference between true be-
 lievers who do indeed persevere: and time-servers, who do not persevere, to whom he
 doth not grant for the present, the privilege of being the house of God. And then he
 hath this 2^d. Doct. such as shall make defection final are not a part of Gods house for the
 present; howsoever they be esteemed. I believe any judicious Reader will see this Inter-
 pretation somewhat more genuine then that of Mr. Lockiers.

without

* See Pare-
 us, Hyper. &
 others in
 Marlorat.
 Excellent
 is Mr. Dru-
 Dickson (a
 man of ex-
 ercised sen-
 ses in the
 Word of
 God) his
 opening of
 these words
 N. 3. He
 (the Apo-
 stle) addeth
 a condition
 if we hold
 fast, &c. i.e.
 if we con-
 tinue sted-
 fast inward-
 ly gripping
 the promi-
 sed glory
 by hope, &
 outwardly
 avowing by
 confession,
 CHRIST'S
 Truth. Whereby
 he neither
 importeth
 the pos-
 sibility of

Which if without it, they might be so readily an apprehension of apallacy, he will have from true grace. But tell me, doth the Apostle when he saith, *if ye hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of hope firm unto the end, mean thus; if ye have and hold fast these things so far as men can judge?* What *visitation* of this appeareth in the Text? May is not the Apostle in that whole Chapter speaking of grace to be performed and held fast *in veritate rei*, in very deed? Was there ever any Interpreter that expoundeth him otherwise. In the Ecclesiastick Court, he may as soon get a Visible Church, as a new World in the Moon, or Mr. Moyer Uppia.

SECTION IV.

The Authors Texts which he calls his and shadows of his Doctrine.

6. 1. **T**He first is, *Mat. 16.* on which place the Author, thus: note *these things.* 1. That Christ doth not speak here of the *Invisible Church*. For he speaks of the power of the *keyes*, binding and loosing on earth; the *Invisible Church* is the greatest part in heaven; and they which are in earth, considered as one with them, as one intire universall Body whereof Christ is the Head, are not capable of *Visible*, and limited Discipline; therefore I judge we are to gather from Christ's Words, that he speaks, by way of anticipation, of that visible order which he did purpose to institute, after his departure, by his Apostles, whereof Peter was one. 2. Observe of what matter he saith this building should be, viz. of such as have a faith which flesh and blood cannot reveal, and to a body thus confirmed is the power of the *keyes*, and both these represented and personated in one in Peter. I do not find the learned and Orthodox of latter times apply this place to the *Invisible Church*, and I think I am not then a forcer of the Scripture in the sense I gave of it.
6. 2. **A**nswer. I wonder much how this has fallen from the Authors mouth, and Pen, that he saith he doth not find the learned and Orthodox of latter times to apply this place to the *Invisible Church*. Do not all the learned and Orthodox Writing against the Papists on the Controversie of the Church, refuse the Papists expounding

expounding it of the Visible Church, and prove it to be understood of the Invisible Church and every member thereof, and do not the learned Orthodox commonly Writing against the *Arminians* upon the controversie of perseverance, apply it to the Invisible Church, and use it as one of the prime Arguments for proving the certain finall perseverance of true Beleevers. See these noted on the Margin. Nay some eminent Papists themselves have acknowledged that is spoken not of the Visible Church, but of the Invisible. *Ferus. non loquitur de Ecclesiâ ut communiter sumitur pro his qui Christiani dicuntur, sive boni sint sive mali, sed de Ecclesiâ secundum Spiritum qua solos electos complectitur.* So *Cajetan* on the same place, *Adversus Ecclesiam qua constat ex Congregatione fidelium unâ fide, spe & charitate, &c.*

Whiaton de Ecclesiâ dicens, non tenetur presertim illa loca, q. 1. c. 1. Ecclesia aliquando totum corpus electorum significat, ut in Synbolo dicitur, Credo Ecclesiam Catho-

*tholicam; sic in hoc loco Math. 16. 18. & c. 13. pag. 1. per tot. & q. 3. c. 1. he propoundeth the Question with the Papists thus: De Ecclesiâ in Petra edificatâ queritur inter adversarios & nos, siue visibilis an invisibilis? And par. 3. he determines according to the Protestant Doctrine that it is invisibilis. & c. 2. Bellarminus dicit Calvinum non potuisse unum Scripturæ locum proferre ubi nomen Ecclesiæ invisibili Congregationi tribueretur. Resp. (inquit) falsum hoc esse — nam Ecclesia aliquando invisibilem Congregationem significat, — in hoc ipso loco quem tractamus, Super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. & q. 3. c. 2. §. 2. 2. Advers. argumentum solumur ex his locis in quibus nomen Ecclesiæ expresse ponitur, ut Math. 16. 18. 1 Tim. 3. 15. in utroque loco (inquit Adversarius) agitari de Ecclesiâ visibili, & tamen ipsam veritatem audivimus asserentem potius inferiorem non prævalituras. — Resp. (inquit Whit.) illam quidem Ecclesiam de qua loquitur Christus — nunquam posse deficere, — sed quod asseruit illam Ecclesiam, de qua loquitur Christus, esse visibilem, illud asseruisse falsissimum. Here is a plain and round contradiction to Mr. Lockiers note upon this place. *Joan. Alsted. suppl. Chamier. de Ecclesi. nat. l. 1. c. 17. par. 2. Resp. 2. Duo ista loca (N. Math. 16. 18. 1 Tim. 3. 15.) agunt de Ecclesia Catholica & invisibili seu interna. qua constat ex solis bonis, neque enim Ecclesia visibilis qua constat ex bonis & malis est fundata super Petram Anton. Wall. Loc. Com. de Ecclesia militans on the question, An Ecclesia possit errare, in Ans. to the 1. Obje. of Papists upon this place, Math. 16. 18. Negamus (inquit) hunc locum esse intelligendum de Ecclesiâ visibili, sed universali & invisibili cui propriis compesit hæc firmitas insuperabilis. The Orthodox in *Colloq. Hagien. et Amisus* in his Coron. presse it as a prime place for the perseverance of Saints. We might instance very many more, but we need not; the thing is known to all acquainted in Orthodox Writers.**

Mr. Lockiers reason brought to prove that it is not spoken of the Church Invisible, is but weak: which will appear the better if it be put into form (for it is somewhat confusedly propounded by himself) as I conceive it may be thus: That Church is understood

F

here

here which is capable of visible & limited Discipline; but the Church Invisible is not capable of this: Therefore, &c. *Ans.* 1. How is the Major or first Proposition proven? By insinuation thus: *He speaks of the power of the keys, binding and loosing on earth. What thence? Ergo, he speaks before of such a Church as is capable of visible limited Discipline.* If I deny the Consequence, how will he prove it? I do not see it, nor think he shall ever be able to make it out. 2. But to passe the Proposition, let's see the proof of the Assumption. *The Invisible Church is the greatest part in Heaven, and they which are in earth as one with them, as one entire universall body whereof Christ is the Head, are not capable of,* &c. *Ans.* 1. That part of the universall Church which is in Heaven is impertinently brought on the stage here: Christ is speaking of those that are yet to be built, or are a building; therefore we say He is speaking of such as are on earth. 2. Albeit that part of the Invisible Church that is on earth be not capable of visible and limited Discipline, *formally considered as such, i. e.* as the Invisible Church: nor yet *collectively considered, as one intire body*: yet the Invisible Church *materially, i. e.* these that are the Invisible Church, being also a part of the Church visible, and considered *distributively* in parts, may be capable of visible Discipline. *David, Peter, John,* and the rest who make up the Church Invisible, as they are also outward Professours with others, are capable of visible Discipline. O! then you will say, why? Are they not spoken of here, *I will build my Church,* as they are a visible Church. *Ans.* It doth not necessarily follow: for to persons standing under diverse considerations, one thing may be attributed, according to one consideration, and another according to another.

¶ 3. As to his 2^d. Observation. 1. It is contrair in it self to Truth, that the visible Church is to consist only of such as have a faith. (he means *fidem quā creditur*, or taken *subjective*: for we shal grant it of faith *quā creditur*, or taken *objective*) which flesh and blood cannot reveal, *i. e.* true saving faith. The Church may consist of such as have not that faith: and the Author addeth not here his qualification of *so far as men can judge*: neither can it be admitted here. 2. Qualifie it as he will, it is a meer violenting of the Text; sundry Interpretations by diverse have been given on these words:

Upon

Upon this Rock will I build my Church: but I think few or none ever before our Author gave such an interpretation as this: *The visible Church shall be constitute only of such as have true saving faith in them, so far as men can judge*. Certainly whether we take the Church Invisible or the Church Visible to be meant here under the name of the Church, Mr. Lockiers sense cannot have place; For, 1. Understanding by the name of *Church*, the Church Invisible in that sentence, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, Christ is not speaking of gathering and constituting a certain incorporation or society, in the state and condition of such an incorporation or society, and how persons, of whom it is to be made up, must be antecedently qualified, that they may be capable of admission to be constituent members thereof: but speaking of his own act of efficacious grace (put forth in deed with the Ministry of the Gospel) upon the hearts of some persons (whom he calls his Church, because they are called out from amongst the rest of the world to himself) which doth not suppose them antecedently having faith, and, taking them as such, state them in a society: But indeed is the very giving to them that faith, and stating them in an impregnable condition of grace and salvation. Whether by, *this Rock*, we understand that faith which *Peter* confessed, or Christ the object of that faith; or *Peter* himself considered in regard of his Ministry of the Gospel: or the Gospel Preached by him (as some of the Orthodox do) certainly this is the meaning of building the Church upon the Rock, supposing (that which I do incline most to, with the most part of Reformed Divines) that by the Church is meant the Church Invisible. 2. If by the name of the Church here be understood the Church Visible, as some later Orthodox Divines have expounded it, namely judicious and learned *Hudson* in his accurate and elaborate Vindication of the *Essence and Unity* of the Catholick Visible Church: Yet it will little avail Mr. Lockiers purpose. 1. Because it is a particular Congregation, and the qualification of members, to be admitted thereunto, that he is speaking of all along under the name of a visible Church. But supposing this place to speak of the visible Church, it cannot be understood of a particular visible Church or Congregation, but must of necessity be understood of the Catholick visible Church, because it is such a Church

as is so stand firm and impregnable that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it: but any particular Church may be prevailed against. 2. Taking the name of the Church so, here the meaning of the whole sentence upon this Rock I will build my Church, is nothing else but this (as the learned Author, but now cited, well observeth) that the Profession and Doctrine of this Truth, that the Messiah is already come, & that this Jesus is the Messiah, & this Jesus the Messiah is the Son of God, the Doctrine and confession that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, 1 Joh. 4. 2, 3. and the believing that *I am he* (saith Christ) Joh. 8. 24. is the foundation whereon the Church of the New Test. is to be built; out of all which nothing more can follow, as to the qualification of members of the visible Church, of the New Test. then this; that when as the Jews under the Old Test. beleaved in an indefinite Messiah to come: now under the New Test. none can be of the Christian Church, but such as believe and confess that the Messiah is come, &c. Now I appeal to all the Orthodox World, if Mr. Lockier his commenting upon this place be not a forcing of the Text. As for what he addeth, *that to a body thus constitute (i. e. a Visible Church so constituted as he has been saying) is the power of the keyes given, and by these represented, and personated to us in Peter*. To passe, I cannot well understand how it can be said that the power of the keyes could be represented and personated in Peter (possibly the Church might be represented and personated in him) This belongeth not to our present Question, and therefore we passe it now, trusting with the Lords assistance afterward to evidence that both assertions, viz. that the power of the keyes were given to a Church Visible, I mean the collective Church, and so to it is as the subject, and that Peter in receiving them here did represent and personate the Church; are groundlesse.

54.

The next shadow or hint is, Rev. 11. 2. *And there was given me a Reed, &c.* Hereupon the Author maketh much ado. 1. He layeth down grounds by Interpreting particulars in the words. 1. Saith he, by the Temple is meant the Visible Church, the state and welfare of which, though most infested of any publick condition, shall not be left and ruined, but be carefully looked to and raised from its corruptions, inrusions, and ruines made by unsound men. This is confirmed by a Testimony of Marlorat, *hunc in modum*

juber ut Ecclesiam, &c. 2. By altar is meant, *per synecdochen*, the whole Worship of God, this is confirmed by the Testimony of the same Author. 3. What is meant by worshippers is plain of it self. 4. The state of worship and worshippers now under the Gospel is to be measured, kept regulated to an exact rule. What is that (*viz.* rule) by the Word of God? To confirme this is brought the testimony of the same Author. 5. By the Court which is without the Temple is meant men which have only outside Religion and devotion, but are destitute of the power thereof. 6. What is meant by the not measuring of these? That same Author (saith he) telleth us *ne complectaris eos in spiritali edificio Domini*, do not imbrace them to be matter of the spirituall house, they are without, and let them be cast out. Why? must not such be received nor abide in the Church seing they have a profession? Because, first, saith that Author (*Marlorat*) the house is spirituall, holy, they are not congruous matter. Secondly, saith *John*, these are given to the Gentiles, *i. e.* (saith *Marlorat*) *ipsi sunt facti conformes gentibus incredulis, immo deterioriores sunt illis quantalibet sanctitatis specie polleant, nam traditi sunt in reprobum sensum, &c.* And saith Mr. Lockier himself such kind of Professours and outside Christians will soon in times of temptations conform themselves to the worst of men, yea and be worse then they, and will strike in with the vilest to tread down the holy citie, *i. e.* the true worshippers in Gods Visible Church, that have name and thing, form and power of Godlines. Then he tells that he cites *Marlorat* not as finding him fully of his judgement, but to see how he and other good men of the reformed Churches, speak unawares his judgement, and cannot tell how else to give any life to places of Scripture. Neither can a man tell how to make themselves agree with themselves in their commentaries without taking them with a grain of salt in this manner. After all these grounds laid down, he inferreth upon the whole this conclusion, that persons professing meerly the things of God are not approved and allowed mater by the Lord in a Visible Church, they are such as he doth not measure, embrace for his building; they are such as are fit to destroy, not to build the holy City. And these Christ not allowing of them, nor measuring of them:

them : but casting them by, and will do if we do not ; how then we can, but at our perill, both in order to God, and order to such men, embrace them. I know not. Thus he upon this place.

S. 1.

Ans. 1. Here a word or two in the generall. First, I say, Mr. Lockier doth confidently enough (to say no more) but very poorly, with bare assertions without the least proof triumph over these good men (as he calls them, hinting as it seemeth, that tho good, yet they were not very deep nor discerning, at least in this matter) of the reformed Churches, as speaking his opinion unawars, and not able to expound Scriptures else, and as contradicting and clashing against themselves, unlesse a grain of his Interpretation be allowed them ; *Parcum ista viris.* Who are these good men in the Reformed Churches that have spoken unawars his opinion concerning the constitution of the Visible Church ? I wish he had named the men and designed the place where they say it ; Nay were it not we are unwilling this peece should grow too big, we could produce of these good men, who have directly and solidely refused Mr. Lockiers Tenet, as he hath it, in ancient Anabaptists. He would have done well also to have pointed us to some of these places of Scripture which they could not tell how to give life to, without compliance with his Tenet, and some of those seeming contradictions in their commentaries, which cannot be agreed without that graine he speaketh of ; untill he do this, we must account what is spoken by him here, but groundlesse and empty boasting.

2. That in the whole discourse upon this place Mr. Lockier speaks so, as that he cannot be Interpret, but to hold none to be members of the Visible Church, but such as are endued with true saving grace and the power of Godlinesse *in veritate rei.* He never once in it mentioneth that qualification *so far as men can judge.* Yea, his expressions are such as cannot possible admit it, as will appear in following the particulars ; To which now we come.

S. 6.

We begin with some notes upon the conclusion. 1. I aske here what he understands by *meer professing the things of God* ? Whether such professing, as is opposite to, and destitute of, even morall and ordinary seriousnessse, which may sometimes be without an inward saving worke of grace ; yea or outward convincing positive evidences of it : Or as it is opposite unto an inward saving work ?

If

If he meant the former, he shall not have us to contradict his conclusion; we shall grant him that such as have not so much as an ordinary *morally* serious profession, such as evidently professe the things of God histrionically, mockingly, manifestly purposing to deceive, are neither allowed of Christ, nor to be admitted by men as mater of the Visible Church. If he say the other, and so that none are to be admitted into the Visible Church, but such as beside profession, have also really true, inward, saving grace, he putteth the Church upon an impossibility; and in this will be disclaimed by all the judicious of his way. If it shall be said, it may be he meaneth neither, but such a profession as is opposite to positive convincing evidences of grace to the judgement of discerning men, and so far as they can judge. I say, 1. This is not said by himself there, nay, he cannot say it and hold to all what he saith here. Why? because some may be such, as far as men can judge, and yet such as Christ will cast out, yea, and hath casten out: and men may be such and yet fit to destroy the holy City. 2. Persons may be such as are not approved and allowed mater by the Lord in the Visible Church, and yet the Church may admit them into the Church, without any perill in order to God, *i. e.* without sinning by admitting them: as for instance, *Simon Magus*. If he say he meanes not here the Lords not approving & not allowing persons *simpliciter* and in point of their duty, but in relation to Ecclesiastick proceeding with them *in foro exteriore*; he shall not have us dissentient from him about this in the generall. But himself hath never this distinction of the Lords approving or not approving, when from it at any time he reasoneth to the admitting or not admitting of such persons. Yea for ought that can be perceived along this Peece, he seemeth alwayes to speak of Gods approbation or not-approbation of persons in point of their owndatie & *simpliciter*. But now to put the most candid construction and Interpretation upon his conclusion, let it be so, that by mater not approved and not-allowed of the Lord in the Visible Church is meant not-approved and not-allowed (no *simpliciter*) but in relation to Ecclesiastick proceeding, *in foro exteriore*: and by persons meely professing, be meant persons not truly gracious (not of necessity in truth of existence, but) at least so far as men can discern and judge.

judge. Come we now to see what shadow of this point is in the Scripture alledged here: I shall go through the grounds laid down from it in order.

5. 7.

To the first, It hath some shew of contradiction. that he saith,
1. That the Visible Church shall not be left and ruined; and then again that it shall be raised from its ruines made by unsound men. If he say that in the former he means utter and lasting ruine, and in the latter, ruine in part and for a time: Well, that would have been expressed, so it appears not well how this said here, *the state and welfare of the Visible Church shall not be left and ruined*, can consist with that said, pag. 11. *that the institution of Christ was so corrupted in the first Churches, that Christ did write Loamm upon them, and that quickly after the Apostles dayes.* But I would ask here the Author, what he means by the *Visible Church*, that *shall not be left and ruined*? Whether any one particular Congregation or the Catholick Visible Church? If the Catholick Visible Church, I shall grant that the state and welfare thereof though never so much infested shall not be left and ruined utterly: But I doubt much if Mr. Lockier will acknowledge such a Visible Church: sure I am, these of his way, are very averse from acknowledging it, (though it be a thing most certain and clear in the Word of God) because indeed the granting of it undermines all the frame of their Independent way: Yea and he himself all along his Peece, treating of the mater of the Visible Church, speaks of a Visible Church, which is nothing else but a particular Congregation. If he mean any one particular Congregation (which is most sureable to his way) I see not how it can be truly said that it shall not be left and ruined; sure, we find no promise in the Word for this, and the experience of many particular Churches that have been ruined utterly and never raised again, proves the contrary. 2. He saith, that by the *Temple* in that place, Rev. 11. is meant the Visible Church, and doth no more but say it: that which is alledged from *Marlorat* * makeith nothing for this. This Author only saith; *hunc in modum jubet ut Ecclesiam Joannes metiatur*, &c. but saith not, *Ecclesiam Visibilem*. Nay, it may appear evidently to any attentive Reader, that this Author all along his commentary upon the place in hand, understands by the name of the Church, the

*Note the passages cited out of Marlo here, by Mr. Lockier, and to be cited by us, are not all Marlorat's own words: yet because they are by him gathered from others, they may be accounted his by approbatio & so be conveniently cited under his name.

the Church Invisible, the society of the Elect true Beleevers, who are Christs Mystical body. See especially these passages * noted in the Margin. But let it be so, that by the Temple is meant the Visible Church, we conceive this may well be meant, and the differing and distinguishing thereof from the Antichristian Synagogue falsely arrogating to themselves the title and priviledges of the Church. Go we on then to see what the Author out of this, and what followes, will make out for his point.

(*etc.*) calls them *Ecclesiam de qua non sum hereticus & hypocrisis, quamquam in ea versari videantur*, and cites for clearing thereof, 1 Joh. 2. 19. which all Orthodox against Arminians, on the point of perseverance, expounds of the elect and truly gracious, i. e. the Church invisible. 3. On these *& ne meriamur illud*] calls it *spirituale edificium quod nunquam corrumpere poterit*, and distinguisheth such from these that are casten out, as elect from reprobates.

* 1. On these words
*& datus est
 mihi*] he
 calls them
*pios Dei cul-
 tores, item
 electos.* 2.
 On these
arum quod

For the 3d. ground: Albeit by the *Altar* some learned, and God. s. s. ly commentators, as namely *Parent*, understand Christ: Yet let it be, as the Author saith, that thereby is meant by a *Synecdoche* the whole Worship of God, and passing the third. As to the fourth, I would first inquire why the Author saith by way of restriction that the worship and worshippers *now under the Gospel* are to be measured, and kept regulated to an exact rule, *viz. the Word of God*? What, were not the worship and worshippers under the Old Test. also to be measured, and kept regulated to the Word of God? Were these things then left loose to be disposed on and ordered at mens pleasure? I wot not well what this restriction means; but sure I am it looks ill-favourably: The Author will do well to clear himself in it. 2. But how will he prove, that which he only takes here for granted, that the intention of the Spirit of God in this Scripture is to hold forth a generall rule concerning the outward constitution of the Visible Church, as to the mater thereof, and how members ought to be qualified for admission to it, and not rather in a Prophetickall vision, to foretell what was to come to passe *de facto* concerning the Church-worship, and adherers to the true worship; sundry learned Interpreters conceive that this latter is the intention and purpose of this vision, that the true Church, the true worship of God, and the worshippers after that true maner of worship of God instituted by himself, was to be brought to great

straits, obscurity, and paucitie, in comparison of the false and Antichristian Church, worship, and worshippers; and that this is meant by the *measuring with the Rod*, and not the regulating of the state of the Church, and qualification of members. See both *Brightman* and *Merbiston* upon the place. But 3. Grant the meaning of the place to be, as if the Spirit had said to *John*, hold forth dogmatically that the Church (as to its constitution) the worship, and such as are to be acknowledged worshippers, are to be regulated by the rule of the Word of God (which we deny not in the generall) then I ask what is that particular rule held forth in the Word by which persons are to be regulated, and discerned in relation to their admission to fellowship of outward worshipping?

5. 9. He goeth about to make this manifest in the fifth and sixth grounds we marked laid down by him, to which, and what is said by him in the following forth thereof, we repute these things.
1. The Court which is without (or as some others read, within) and to be casten out; others understand far otherwayes, not of persons, but of the outward and visible face and state of the Church; and by the casting of it out, rejecting, casting off care of it, and giving of it over for a time, *viz.* of Antichristian power and prevalency to be possessed by Antichristian and idolatrous people, because of their following and practising heathenish-like wayes and idolatrie: So *Merbiston*. And certainly it is very likely that the Court here cannot denotate persons, I mean professors to be casten out of the Visible Church; because it is said to be given to the heathen, and these heathen are these very persons, that are said to be casten out. The Interpretation in *Marlorat* is exceeding harsh, and hath no probability in congruity of speech, to wit, to cast out hypocrites and idolaters, *i. e.* the Court, because it is given to the heathen. 1. Because they are become like the infidel heathens. Where shall we finde the like speech, that persons are said to be given unto such and such persons because they are become like unto them.
 2. But grant, by this Court persons are meant, and that by not measuring of them is meant not imbraceing of them, but casting them out. How doth *Mr. Lockier* prove, that these persons are all such as have but an outside of worship, and are destitute of the power of Religion, even albeit their Religion be true and right

right *objectively*, and in the nature and kinde of it; and their profession *morally* serious. This he must not only affirm, but prove, if he would say any thing convincingly to the point he taketh in hand to deduce. What if I shall say, not such persons, but Antichristian, idolatrous persons are understood hereby? What can he bring from the Text, or reason to prove what he saith? 3. Let's see his reasons he bringeth to shew that such as have only an outside worship, Religion, and devotion, but are destitute of the power thereof are not to be imbraced as mater of the Visible Church, but held out or cast out. The 1. is brought from *Marlorat*, because the house, saith he, is spirituall, and holy, they are not congruous mater, *ne complectaris eos in spiritali edificio Domini.* *Ans.* 1. That spirituall house or edifice *Marlorat* speaks of, is the true Church Invisible, *spiritali edificio Domini quod nunquam corrumpere poteris*: Mr. *Lockier* has slipped these words. 2. *Marlorat* comprehends under these that are the Court, all the reprobate mixed with the Elect, tho they were even as gilded hypocrites, as of whom it may be said (which Mr. *Lockier* saith) they are true converts as far as men can judge; as is evident all along. 3. *Marlorat* speaks not of casting them out of visible societie with the spirituall house of the Elect, by *Disciplinarie* ejection of singular persons distinctly, (but by *Doctrinall* conviction, and denunciation of destruction against them) except in the case of evidently manifested rebellion or obstinacy. So he upon these words, & *advances in eo*] *quando hypocritarum magna semper fuit copia in mundo, & reprobi electis nunquam non permixti fuerunt, Pastor in munus est, quo ad fieri potest, inter utrosque discernere, ut pios Dei cultores, verbi Dei pabulo pascat, exhortetur, consoletur, foveat; reliquos ad Dei tribunal citet, & extremum illis exitum Dei nomine pronunciet* (all this is but *Doctrinall* not terminat ad signata individua, (as they call them) i. e. to definite singular persons) atq; etiam si se prorsus rebelles prodiderint impiis, publica autoritate coerceantur & a ceteris reliquorum ejiciantur. All this we grant willingly, yet without any advantage to Mr. *Lockier*. 2. *Reas.* Why must these out-court-Christians not be taken in? Why, *John* saith, those are given to the Gentiles, i. e. saith *Marlorat*, *ipsi facti sunt conformes gentibus incredulis, &c.* *Ans.* 1.

As we said before it is altogether improbable that by the Court is meant persons, but a thing, and it seemeth to be a most forced sense, and without example, *given up to the Gentiles; i. e. they are become like the Gentiles.* Next we say it is most evident from the end of this *ver.* that the Spirit speaks not these words as a rule prescribing what he or others should do in governing the Church; but as a prediction of somewhat that was to come to passe, this I say is evident by the designation of the circumstance of the time or duration of that which is spoken of in the end of the *vers.* But *21.* Mr. *Lockier* supposeth two things which he mainly should have proven, that the *outer-court-Christians* are all that have not the power of Godliness in their heart, though their profession and practice in Religion be objectively right and true, and subjectively serious. 2. That casting them out and not measuring them must be understood of Disciplinary ejection, upon that very account that they have not the power of Godliness. 3. As to that he addeth himself *such kind of Professours will soon in times of temptations, &c.* 'tis true, they may be ready to do so; but tell me, will not even some such fine, well guided Professours, who may seem as far as men can judge to have the power of Godliness in their heart, be such as will be ready soon to do the same? Yes; because when all is done they may be but outside Professours. *Simon Magus, Hymenem, and Alexander* must have been at their reception into the Church, by Mr. *Lockiers* principles, such as were true converts so far as men could judge; yet we see them ready soon to conform themselves to the worst of men. Thus, I humbly conceive, we have made it clear that Mr. *Lockier* hath little ground for his doctrine from this Text, most part of the pillars of his discourse being meer suppositions, taken for granted, but having no light of proof from the words, as also that he had as little cause to boast of *Marlorats* complying with it unawares.

The 3^{d.} and last shadow or hint is, *Rev. 4. Which whole Chapter is taken up to shew the state of the holy City fore-mentioned; and in the 1. *vers.* observe. John is taken up to Heaven to have the frame of this new building given him. After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in Heaven, and the first voice which I heard — which said come up hither, and I will shew thee things which*

which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the Spirit, and behold a Throne was set in Heaven, &c. Moses had his pattern upon the Mount nigh Heaven, not in Heaven. And yet some very learned men think that even that was reaching what that people should be which walked in that first house, perhaps really very nigh Heaven, with which compare, Ezek. 44. 7. But John hath his pattern given him in Heaven, to shadow that this Temple, Altar, worshippers should all indeed be from above, and such as should indeed have an internall consecration, and the Law given into the mind, as the Author to the Hebrews saith, and made Jews inwardly, a holy Nation, according to inward call and choise, and so a spirituall Priesthood.

Ans. 1. Here again we are to mark the Conclusion that Mr. *Lockier* would be at, touching the matter of the Visible Church, such as are all indeed from above, as have indeed an internall consecration, the Law given into the mind, made Jews inwardly, an holy Nation, according to inward choise and call. Here indeed is an Anabaptistickall model of the Visible Church, all reall saints, and not in the judgement of charity only. Mr. *Lockier* so far as spirituall men can judge, as it is wholly left out by himself, so it cannot well be admitted to have any place here. 1. Because he saith they are all indeed from above, and have indeed an internall consecration, that indeed I think to every mans apprehension noeth *veritatem rei in se*, or *iudicio veritatis* (as they call it) as contrarily distinguished a *iudicio charitatis* of spirituall men. 2. Because that place, Heb. 8. 10. cited from Jer. 31. 33. brought in by him for confirmation of his purpose, he is speaking of, (of the impertinency whereof to the purpose in hand, I mean, the constitution of the Visible Church, we shall speak presently) speaketh of truth and reality of grace in the heart, I may say, in the very judgement of God himself under which there is no possibility of mistake; But to the grounds he goeth upon from this Text. 3. He taketh for granted, that this whole Chapter is taken up to shew the state of the Visible Church in its constitution, as such, and that it is the Spirits intention in the vision set down in it, to give unto John a pattern thereof to be a rule to him and others then, and succeeding ages, for regulating the constitution of it, and particularly in the

point of Church-members; but why did he not assay some prooffe of this: Must we take every thing upon his bare assertion? 'Tis true, Learned *Brightman* in his commentary conceiveth that this vision containeth a common Type of the holy Church in all ages. But 1. In all the progresse of his commentarie on that Chapter, I find not any evident passage pointing at any particular in the vision,

** Sequitur (to wit from v. 2.) descriptio Auctoris Ecclesiæ, par tim ratione visa illius Majestatis, partim præcepta bonorum rationis ejusdem. Cujus descriptio scopus est primum commendatio apocalypsoe ex Auctore Ecclesiæ, deinde Ecclesiæ in fide et timore Dei ac patientia confirmatio ex Majestate et honoratione illius promanante. Quæ describitur opportunè, nam revelandum est hoc libro mysterium status Ecclesiæ afflictissime &c. so Gomar.*

as a patern, type, or rule, concerning the qualification of such as are to be admitted in the external fellowship of the Visible Church, as the homogeneall parts of the outward visible body. 2. Though I will not stay here to examine the intent of all the particulars in that vision; and though I esteem much of the judgement of that learned and pious man; yet in the generall, I must say, I find no convincing argument, nor much appearance of any argument at all brought by him to prove that the intent of the vision was to give *John* a patern, a certain portraicture or resemblance of the Church, whereby we might know which is she. Yea albeit I confesse sundry particulars in the vision are things of the Church (in the Interpretation whereof I would not much disagree from *Brightman*) yet I think he is mistaken in taking that for the generall intent and purpose of the vision: and conceives that *John* being now to receive a new Prophetickall Revelation concerning these things that were to come to passe in and upon the Church from that time to the end of the World, *vtr. 1. fin.* The intention of the vision of this Chapter is to describe and set forth the Glory and Majesty of God the Father, the first Author of the Prophesie, as in the next Chapter is described the Son the Mediatour and subordinate Author thereof, as it is ordinary when the Lord is to communicate to his Prophets, and by them to the Church, Prophetickall Revelations of great things to come to passe concerning the Church, to present by way of preparation some glorious representation of himself, as we may see, *Esay 6.* and *Ezek. 1.* See these words of the learned and judicious *Gomarus* upon that Chapter, on the Margin *. And certainly had it been the purpose of the Spirit, by this vision to hold forth a patern, portraicture, and resemblance of the true Church common to all ages, least because of troubles and disturbances, we should either think it utterly extinguished, or at least through ignorance of her right form and figure, we should be lesse able

able to know which is the (as Mr. *Brightman* saith) it seemeth the wisdom of the Spirit of God would have portraicted the figure and form of the Church in these things that are most substantiall in the constitution of it, so as Christians of ordinary capacitie might been able to discern & take up the true Church by; but Mr. *Brightman* himself is even troubled to find what things are meant by every particular in the vision. And in some he bringeth but meer conjectures, yea and likely is mistaken, as, could we stay, might be very probably shown; as for example, in his Exposition of the sea of Glasse like Chrystall before the Throne. 3. But what is the particular in the vision from which Mr. *Lockier* deduceth his conclusions? this, *viz.* that it was in Heaven he saw it, *a door was opened in Heaven and the Throne was set in Heaven;* this, saith he, *was to shadow that the ——— worshippers should be indeed from above, &c.* and to make it the stronger, it is confirmed by a comparison of what was done with *Moses*, *Moses had his pattern upon the Mount nigh Heaven, &c.* *Ans.* 1. Here is a thing begged for a ground, that as *Moses* was taken up to the Mount to get a pattern of these things, which he was to appoint in the ancient Church, so *John* is here taken up to get a pattern of the Visible Church, and the things to be ordered in it under the New Test. This, I say, is groundlesly supposed: For these things that were to be done by *Moses* were but now a instituting, and to be first set up: and therefore it was necessary that he should have a pattern of them represented to him to regulate him; but ere the time of this revelation, Christ had fully instituted all particulars belonging to the Church of the New Testament, and many Churches through the World, were already actually settled and ordered according to that institution, and beside sundry of the Books of the New Test. written, wherein the institution and rule was already plainly written down, and this indeed is one reason which inclineth me to think that the scope and intention of the Spirit in this vision was not to give a pattern, and portraicture, or modell of the Visible Church for the time to come. 2. As to that alledged meaning of *Moses* receiving his pattern near Heaven, *viz.* to shew of what qualification the people, *i.e.* the members of the ancient Visible Church should be, (*viz. in foro exteriori*, so must be understand it, if he speak

speaking to the purpose in hand) I will not trouble my self to inquire who may be these very learned men that say so. But the thing it self is but a conjecture: and I desire Mr. Lockyer concerning this, and the expounding of Heaven here, to remember the axiome acknowledged by Schoole-men themselves, otherwise doting on allegories, *theologia symbolica non est Argumentativa*, except where the Spirit of God himself openeth the signification. 3. I desire to know what Mr. Lockyer meaneth by *persons really living very near Heaven*, if truly gracious, then what difference between those, and these afterward brought in with an adverbative opposing them to the former, and why did he propound his Doctrine with a restriction to the time of the Gospel? 4. That pattern which Moses had shown to him in the Mount, according to which he was commanded to make, did not concern the constitution of the body of the then Visible Church, of what, and how qualified persons it was to be made up. But was a pattern of the Tabernacle and the things pertaining to it, *Exod. 25. 9. 40. 5.* The place, *Ezek. 44. 7.* restricted as speaking of the ordinary members of the then Visible Church is not to the purpose, for it speaks of such as were admitted to the Priestly Office. See *Junius and Parani in locum.* 5. As impertinently, and much more impertinently is the place of *Heb. 8. 10.* cited from *Ier. 31. 33.* brought into this discourse concerning the Visible Church, and the matter thereof. I appeal to all judicious Christians in the World, and to Mr. Lockyer himself in second serious thoughts, if that Scripture was intended to be a rule of constituting Congregations: Or if it be not a declaration or revelation of Gods purpose and Decree what he is to do himself by his efficacious grace, and if that Covenant and the promises thereof belongeth not in the fulfilling thereof only to the Lords elect.

SECTION V.

Examination of Mr. Lockyers prooff of his Doctrine by induction.

S. I. **B**UT (saith he) this is not the way which I most mind to make probation by, of this point: I would prove it by induction,

it seemeth then, that he hes not had such confidence in that former way of probation, by testimonies alledged to speak the point in shew: And I humbly leave it to the judicious and impartial Reader to judge, by what hath been said in answer to these passages, if it be not made clearer that he had little ground of confidence in them for proof of his point, and comes now to that way of probation, wherein it seemeth he conceiveth more strength to ly.

The Churches of the Romanes, Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Collossians, Thessalonians, of the Jews which are mentioned by Peter, Iamas, and the Author to the Hebrews, and in the Acts, were all thus constitute of truly Godly, so far as a Godly man can make judgement of one like himself, Ergo. if these be denied as presidents, then I would aske our Brethren of the Presbytery by what rule they walk? But if these be considered as presidents, I have only to shew that these Churches did all thus constitute, though I think they did not long keep and maintain this pure constitution for which they bore their judgement, & yet bear. Ans. Where did Mr. Lockier read, that the judgement comed and yet lying upon these Churches, came upon them for their admitting and permitting to be in their visible society such as were not true converts, such as God the searcher of the hearts of all men can bear witnesse of as indeed sealed for his by his Holy Spirit, as far as men truly converted and very spirituall can discern and judge? We find indeed laid to some of their charge that they suffered scandalous persons, broatchers of errors, and seducers of others into their errors, (such, I mean, maintainers of errors, I trow he and others of his way are now verse from receiving and suffering into their Independent Churches) and I doubt not but for this among other causes, judgement came upon them: But that ever that which he saith was laid to their charge, or that the judgement of God came upon them for that cause, we cannot believe his assertion; we require it to be instanced by prooffe: but to the purpose; he supposeth that beside these particular Churches instanced, and what is said of them in the Epistles written to them, there can be no where in Scripture found any thing holden forth as a rule by which we may walk in the constitution of the visible Church as to the mater or members thereof. So doth his Question (then I would aske our

H

Brethren

Brethren by what rule they walk) import : But we trust ere we have done, to find a rule else where ; yet we shall not deny nor refuse these Churches as presidents in this businessse, in whatsoever can be made cleare to have been their practice in this matter, I mean, the notion and consideration under which persons were admitted onto, and reckoned in their externall Church-fellowship. Come we then to consider the antecedent of this Argument, or what is affirmed in his induction of these Churches. First in the generall, and then his proof thereof particularly. The assertion of them all in generall is, that all of them were constitute of persons truly Godly so far as Godly men could make judgement. *Ans.* 1. Mr. Lockier if he would have made the *attributum* of this induction answerable to his conclusion intended, he should have said they were constitute of persons *all and every one of them* truly Godly, *and none else*. But he speaks only indefinitely, which might be granted: But let us take him to mean so ; this assertion as it lyeth, may be granted in some sense which it may carry, and never a whit advantage redound thereby to his Doctrine ; for it may carry this sense, that these Churches were made up, or did consist of persons all of them truly *materially* Godly *de facto*, and *quoad eventum* ; or it may carry this sense, that they were constitute of persons all truly godly, *formally* considered as such, in their taking them into the constitution and external society of them. Now in the first sense it might be granted (as I suppose some Congregation or Congregations may be such *eventually*, that all the members may be truly godly) & yet no advantage come thereby to his Tenet, unlesse he could prove that the enumeration which he makes is a perfect enumeration of all the particular Churches in Scripture (which he cannot, because it is clearly contrary to truth, and therefore his induction is imperfect) Yea and this also, that there is no other Passage of Scripture, that holds forth a rule or warrant of any larger latitude touching admitting of members into the fellowship of the Visible Church then what is said of these Churches. He must prove then the assertion in the latter sense, *viz.* that these Churches were constitute of persons all truly godly as far, &c. *formally* considered as such, and under no other consideration, in their in-taking and being reckoned members in their outward visible societie : If he could prove this

that of any one of them we should go over to his side of the controversy: But now see how he proveth this, nay all that is brought or can be brought by him, is only this, that the Apostle Writing of these Churches, calleth them *saints, believers, sanctified in Christ Jesus*, and the like, which should we grant to mean inward true grace of regeneration, and to be spoken not of the whole body *collectively* and *confuse*, only giving the denomination of the whole from the better part; but *distributively* of all and every one of them; yet nothing else could necessarily be concluded from this, but that they were such *de facto* and *quo ad eventum*, and not that they were gathered and received into the externall fellowship of these Churches formally upon this and no other account: that they were such reall, internall, truly regenerate saints. The Apostles in the place cited speaks not, nor intimates one word concerning the order of proceeding, or account whereupon the proceeding was made in the visible externall constituting and setting up of these Churches, or admitting of members into them, neither doth Mr. Lockier so much as once assay to make a proove of this point; only after he hes cited some passages concerning the *Corinthians*, he saith, pag. 22. end, and pag. 23. begin. that these expressions should import that they did constitute & gather together upon any other account, but as there was the true grace of God evident as far as men could judge, I cannot indeed see. Alas! 1. Is this to prove that which being the very main pinch of the Question, to say no more for it, but you cannot see how it was not done so. 2. But I forbear to exaggerat this way of reasoning. We are sure he might see in Scripture how persons were gathered and received into the fellowship of the Visible Church upon another account, and trust by the Lords assistance ere we have done to let it be seen by such as will not shut their eyes upon the light of the Word. Thus we have said already, doth sufficiently discover the weaknesse and nullity of the inductive Argument to the point in controversy. And I must say, I wonder that Learned men (such as I do with all respect, acknowledge our Independent Brethren to be) should have put such confidence in it.

But 2. Let's see if he can prove that all these Churches were *de facto* and *quo ad eventum*, constituted and made up of persons all

truly Godly so far as Godly and discerning men could make judgement, such as upon tryall would give evidence of the true grace of God in them as far as men could judge. First then for the Romans is cited, chap. 1. vers. 6, 7, 8, 9, where they are written to by Paul (who surely was able to discern in spirituall matters, and durst not complement with persons in things of eternall concernment) under the styles of the called of Iesus Christ, called Saints, beloved of God, these whose faith is spoken of through all the world, and the Apostle writes to all that are at Rome, and thanks God for them all, and made mention of them all in his prayers. Well, what hence? I cannot think (saith he) that a faith of so high esteem with Paul, and of such renown through the Christian world, and the mater of such fervent Prayer should mean only a temporary faith. Why? Some of these were such as laid down their neck for Paul, Rom. 16. 4. the rest surely in danger of their own necks every day by their profession, living in the mouth of that Tyrant Nero, as Paul calleth him (it should be Lion) or Dragon, as John calls all Heathen Emperours of that place. Answ. 1. We will not say it is a temporary faith he speaks of, we grant it to be a saving persevering faith, and for confirmation of this he might added a stronger ground from the Text: then these he hath chosen, that they are all called beloved of God, and called Saints, where, as *Eskins* noteth well, *intelligitur vocatio non communis & externa, &c.* i.e. is understood, not common and outward calling, but that whereby men are effectually called to faith, holiness, and salvation, which is the calling according to purpose and Predestination: But now will Mr. *Lockier* or any man take upon them to say, that Paul mean'd that all and every one in the Visible Church of Rome, were such as had not a temporary faith only, but a true saving faith, and so were all and every one such as were to be undoubtedly saved. I doubt he will hazard upon this assertion: or if he will, I doubt much if he shall have any other to bear him company in it. May be, he will say, he intends not that, but this, that they were all and every one such, so far as in his judgement he could discern: and he was a man very able to discern in spirituall matters, as he saith a little before. But, 1. This is an addition to the Text, and how will he prove that it was Pauls mind to speak with

with such a qualification? 2. He supposeth that *Paul* had acquaintance and experience of every one of them sufficient to discern what they were, so doth that he saith import, *read Paul who surely was able to discern in spirituall matters*. But this behoved to have been by conversing with them *coram*; and that he could not have, it seemeth; * because he had not yet been at *Rome* to meet with every one of them there, nor is it likely that every one of them had come from *Rome* and met with him elsewhere; or he behoved to have it by communication by Letters from every one of them: And what ground of conjecture have we for this? I think to say it, would be accounted a Dream. As for report, of every one of them and their severall evidences of grace, by others.

1. We have as little ground of conjecture for that, though we find that there has been great fame of their faith in common and in generall, *ver. 8.* 2. Report may be a ground of charitable beliefs (I take belief here in the generall logicall signification of it, as it is contradistinguished from opinion and science) but it cannot be a ground of a positive discrete judgement, such as Mr. *Lockier* attributeth to *Paul* touching the *Romanes* faith, for it implieth a mans own personall experience of things. 2. We say the Apostle in these titles of *beloved of God*, *Saints*, *Believers*, meaneth true saving grace, truly existing, and not in the judgement of charity only: But speaketh there not of all the *Romanes* *universaliter & distributive*, as we say all men are sinners, but *communiter & collective*, & *confuse*, i. e. in common, collectively, and confusedly; because undoubtedly saving grace was amongst them, and he could not take upon him to determine, whether more or fewer of them were endued with it, and as it seems knew nothing to the contrary of any of them particularly, but they might be such. Thus verily I think the Apostles writing to whole Churches, and calling them generally by the name of *Saints*, *faithfull*, &c. may well be understood; and no other thing can be demonstrate of their meaning: Take herewith the judgement of the Learned Commentators on the place, all of which do unanimously determine that these titles of *Saints*, *faithfull*, and the like, are given by the Apostles to the Churches; partly in respect of the end of their calling, and the duty of every one in the Church, *viz.* that the end of their

calling, and their duty is to be such; and partly by a denomination taken *a parte priori*, from the better part, because there were true real Saints and beleivers amongst them. And I think it is a worthy and solide consideration, which my worthy Colleague in the Ministry and my Reverend Superior in the Colledge live in, hath in his due right of Presbytery, pag. 259. in answer to Mr. Cotton upon this same Question and Argument, *the styles given to the Church of Corinth are too high to be given to hypocrites* (such as many of Mr. Lockiers truly godly so far as men can judge, may be and often are) *but these styles are not given to that Church precisely, as Visible, and as a professing Church, but as an Invisible, and true Church of Beleivers*: He writeth to a *Visible Church*, but he doth not speak of them alwayes as a *Visible Church*, but as of an *Invisible* when he calleth them *Temples of the Holy Ghost*, &c.

S. 4.

What we have said to his alledgeance concerning the Church of Rome, is applicable to what is said to the most part of the rest: so that we shall not insist much on them. Only a word or two of some of them. And 1. For the *Corinthians*, after he hath set down what is spoken to them, chap. 1. vers. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. and chap. 4. 15. he subjoyneth persons having such grace in them, as shall be confirmed to the end, as keepeth them waiting to the coming of the Lord Jesus, as are the comfortable seals of a faithfull Ministry, that all this should signifie but an outward Profession, or to say that this Church should constitute, and Congregate together upon any other account, but as there was the true grace of God evident, as far as men could judge, I cannot indeed see. *Ans.* 1. Let it be marked how in citing the place, chap. 4. 15. he maketh an addition to the Text, for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you all, this all is put in as the Apostles word, when as in the Text there is no more but I have begotten you. This is a grosse, foule slip, I will not say it hath been done out of designe, may be it has been done inconsiderately, without present turning over to the place, however, adding to the Word of God is a dangerous practice. 2. As for that to say that this Church did constitute and gather upon another account, &c. we have noted on it sufficiently before. I adde now this, by what Mr. Lockier saith here, and

and indeed by the Doctrine of all the Independent Brethren of his way. in this mater of the constitution of the Visible Church, it appeareth that their conception about the order of gathering the Visible Church by the Apostles was this, that men being first turned to the Profession of Christian Religion, there was a tryall made of their evidences of true inward saving grace, and such as evidences satisfactory of this were found in, these were gathered in, and the rest casten by, which I dare say is a meer fiction, of which not the least vestige can be shown in Scripture, and never man dreamed of untill these sad times; broodie of many new fancies under the name of new lights. 3. I confesse persons having such grace in them as shall be confirmed to the end, as keeps them waiting for the coming of Christ, as are the comfortable seals of a faithfull Ministry, are not outward Professours only, but are reall Saints and Elect, and thence I conclude, it cannot be understood universally of all and every one of the Visible Church of *Corinth*. Will he say that all and every one were reall Saints, Elect, to be confirmed unto the end, and so eternally saved; if he say, yes, in *Pauls* judgement, so far as he could judge upon evidences of true grace. I say, 1. That is an addition to the Text, *Paul* saith simply he shall confirm you unto the end, &c. not so far as I can judge he shall confirm you. Yea, 2. It enervats the comfort held forth by the Apostle to them he speaks to, for it imports no more upon the mater, but this, possibly ye may be confirmed to the end, and so when all is done ye may be possibly not confirmed to the end: (mans judgement can go no further) and is contrary to the strain of all the Orthodox, writing against the Remonstrants in the Article of perseverance, who understand the place of Saints, and the Lords effectuall gracious preserving them *in veritate rei*, and so make use of the place, and presse it against the Remonstrants. But let Mr. *Lockier* rid himself here; if he will have *Paul* to speak thus of all and every one of the Visible Church of *Corinth*, either he must conceive it spoken only with relation to the state of that Church as its first up-setting: or also in relation to what it was at the present time of the Writing of this Epistle: The former cannot be said, because its most evident all along that Passage, *Chap. 1.* he is speaking of it as still, at the time of his writing, standing in that condition

dition he expresseth in his words, albeit some of the Verbs be used in the preterit perfect tense, no man can deny this who hath any judgement. If he say the latter, the very Epistle it self will confute it, wherein, to wit, so grosse wickednesses, and impieties are discovered to have been amongst them, and laid to their charge, schismes, contentious suits of Law, fornications, communion and fellowship at Idolatrous Tables, drunkennesse at the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, deniall of the Resurrection. Will any man say, that the Apostle knowing such things to be amongst them, speaks of all and every one of them as reall inward Saints as far as men can judge.

§. 5. For the Church of the *Galatians* is cited, *Gal. 4. 9. chap. 6. 1.* the latter whereof is so impertinent to the purpose, that I wonder how it came in his minde to alledge it. The point to be proven is, that the Church of the *Galat.* was constitute of persons all truly godly so far as men could judge: The Apostles meaning in this place is this much, if any amongst you through infirmity or ignorance be surprized and fall into a fault, such among you as are spirituall, i. e. more advanced and confirmed in knowledge and piety, and more experimentally skilled in Christianity, being conscious of your own lyablenesse to temptations, apply your selves to recover and restore such an one with meeknesse and gentlenesse; what is this to that conclusion? If Mr. *Lockier* had assayed to make up a Syllogisme upon it, for inferring that conclusion, he would, I no wayes doubt, have perceived the impertinency of his alledging it. Neither yet doth the former prove the point: for let that knowing of God, and their being known of God, be understood of reality of saving graces: Yet the speech is but indefinite, *after ye have known God, or rather are known of God.* And every body knows, what an indefinite speech can bear in *materia contingente.*

§. 6. For the Church of *Ephesus* is cited, *Eph. 1. 1. 13. and Acts 20. 28. 32.* For the first citation, I mean what is said in the Epistle, we need say no more then what is said upon the *Romanes* and *Corinthians*: The places are all alike, and the same answer serveth all. Only I will say, I am astonished that any man should think or say that these high Heavenly blessings, priviledges, and graces spoken of by the Apostle to the *Ephesians*, as blessed with spirituall bles-

sings

sings in Heavenly places, chosen before the foundation of the World, predestinat to the adoption of Children, to the praise of the Glory of His Grace, accepted in the Beloved, having Redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of sins, obtained the inheritance, sealed with the Spirit of promise, quickned with Christ, raised up together with him to sit in heavenly places &c. are all by the Apostle spoken of and attributed to all and every one in the visible societie of the Church of *Ephesus* so far as he could judge, wherein he himself clearly intimats there were some (and he speaks according to his own knowledge) that were given to teach other Doctrine, giving heed to fables, *1 Tim. 1. 3, 4.* some that had swerved aside to vain jangling, desiring to be Teachers of the Law, &c. *v. 6, 7.* that taught otherwise, not consenting to wholesome words, — proud, knowing nothing, doting about Questions and Strifes of words, *c. 6. 3, 4.* some addicted to the love of Money and Covetousnesse, *v. 9, 10.* striving about words to no profite, but to the subverting of the hearers, vessels to dishonour, as vessels to honour, Reprobates and Cast-aways, as well as Elect, the foundation of the Lord having the seal of Gods Eternal Predestination & Fore-knowledge set upon them, *2 Tim. 1. 19, 20.* those that oppose themselves and were to be brought with meeknesse unto Repentance, and recovered out of the snare of Satan who had them captive at his will, *v. 25, 26.* such as had a forme of Godlinesse but denied the Power thereof, Misleaders and Mislead, *cap. 3. 6, 7.* compare with *v. 5.* who will dare to say that the Apostle writing to a Church, and giving them all these high stiles and commendations, mentioned before; did intend them to all and every one severally and distributively in that Church? Neither will it avail to say, that this Church might been so constitute at first, as that all the Members might been such as these stiles might been given to them, as far as men could judge, though afterward many of them degenerated, and discovered themselves. Unlesse Mr. *Lockier* make it good, that such was the state of that Church in all the Members of it, at the time of the writing of this Epistle to the *Ephesians*, he alleadgeth what is said in it to no effect for his purpose. But it is certain that the first Epistle to *Timothy* was written long before it, this being written long ere he came.

to *Rome*, as Interpreters agree, and that being written from *Rome*, and that, as most think, in the time of his second imprisonment there, and so it seemeth but a little before the second to *Timothie*, which was the last of all.

- S. 7. For the other citation, *Acts* 20. 28, 32. 1. The latter *vers.* 32. any man who sees any thing, may see it clearly impertinent to the purpose in hand. 2. To the other *feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood*, We *Answ.* That by the Church bought with the blood of Iesus Christ, true God, is not meant the Visible Church, as such, as if the meaning of the words were, bought with the blood of Christ in the judgement of charity, or so far as men can judge, (which is a meer addition to the Text;) but the Invisible Church of the Elect, really redeemed: So do all Orthodox Divines writing against Remonstrants on the Article of Redemption, expound it of the Church of the Elect only, and presse it as an Argument against the Remonstrants Universal Redemption, and Remonstrants upon the contrare would have it meant of the whole Visible Church. Mr. *Lockier* hath given no proof that it is spoken of the Visible Church, as such, but thought it enough to point us to the place, and to suppose it be as he would have it. But because Reverend M. *Hooker* in his Survey, *par.* 1. *cap.* 39, 40. assereth the same interpretation of the place with Mr. *Lockier*, against my Reverend Colleague Mr. *Rutherford*, and assaves to give some reason for it; albeit I doubt not ere long, the Church shall have a sufficient answer from Mr. *Rutherford* himself, to that and other things in the Survey: Yet I must crave humble leave of him to say somewhat to M. *Hooker* in this particular, seeing it cometh so far in my way, and otherwise, Mr. *Lockier* and his followers might haply say, I had purposely shunn'd it.

- S. 8. - The Church here (sayeth he) whether Congregationall or Presbyteriall, must needs be visible: *Ans.* That is not the question, nor the thing he should have proven; for we shall confesse the Church here spoken of, and as spoken of in the context, must be visible; but he should have said and proven the Church here spoken of, and said to be bought with the blood of Christ must be the Church Visible, and as such, considered according to

its visible state, and consequently that the attribute of the enunciation is enunciat of all and every one in that state; see we then if the argument he formeth maketh out this: *That over whom Elders and Officers are set to attend to feed by Doctrine and Discipline, this must needs be a visible Church: for unlesse they did see them and know them, how could they execute censure upon them? but these, viz. over whom Elders and Officers are set to attend and feed, &c. are called the Church Redeemed with the Blood of God.* The conclusion is suppressed but according to the terms of the premisses: It can be no other then this, *Ergo* the Church here spoken of must needs be visible. And this we may and do grant, and yet without any prejudice, or disadvantage, for that may well stand with this assertion, that only the Elect or the Church Invisible are intended by that name *Church*, when it is said there to be bought by the blood of God: For why? because the Elect or Invisible Church is visible, i. e. persons seen and obvious to the outward senses, Physically visible, and certainly Mr. Hooker speaks of no more in his *Major* and the proof thereof, *unlesse they do see them and know them* &c. the thing that he should have concluded was this *Ergo*, they are called, redeemed by the blood of God as the visible Church, or according to their Visible Church state; but that will not be inferred upon his premisses. If any man will say, his argument may be upon the terms taken in it, mended and urged to the point thus: *These over whom Officers and Elders are set to attend and feed by Doctrine and Discipline, must needs be a Visible Church; and that considered according to its Visible State, and as Visible; but these over whom Elders and Officers are set, &c. are called the Church Redeemed by the Blood of God, Ergo, these called the Church Redeemed, &c. must needs be a Church Visible: and that as such, and considered according to its Visible State; Then I say, yet the conclusion toucheth not us, for these that are called the Church Redeemed, may be granted to be a Church Visible, and that considered as visible, viz. in relation to some other adjunct of it distinct from that epithet contained in the subject of the conclusion, viz. the denomination of Redeemed by the Blood of God; and this argument as thus formed carrieth no more. But yet if one shall infer the conclusion thus,*

Ergo, these are called the Church Redeemed by the blood of God, as a Church Visible, or considered according to their Visible Church State: Then I say this putteth the Syllogisme out of the wits and whole frame of it, takes the *medium* into the conclusion, for the *minus extremum* or attribute of the assumption. (for the Syllogisme is in the third figure) and jumbles the *major extremum* and *minus extremum* the attribute of the Major Proposition, and the attribute of the assumption together in the attribute of the conclusion, and so makes the Syllogism in whole, to consist of four terms; in a word, let any man take these premises of Mr. Hookers, mend them, shape, and change them as he will, he shall never be able to infer the conclusion that should be inferred to his purpose, that the Church Visible is called the redeemed by the blood of God, as it is visible, or according to its visible state.

S. 9. But, saith he, if any man say, that the Elect are only there intended by that name, Answer, that conceit is contrary to the very strain of the words and scope of the Text, for they must attend [namely] to the whole flock: The charge puts no difference between person and person, nor must their care be different; nay upon this ground the Elders should not know what their care was, nor upon whom they should bestow it, for they might reply, Lord we cannot search into thy secrets, who are Elect and Invisible Saints, we cannot discern them, and therefore we cannot tell how to feed them; whereas by the current and common sense of the Scriptures, taking redeemed and sanctified as visibly, though not really such, the stream of the Text runneth pleasantly without the least appearance of doubt. Answer. 1. Reverend Mr. Hooker affirmeth more, then he proves well, in calling that answer a conceit contrary to the stream of the words and scope of the Text. His first Argument comes to this much; All these are of the Church, which is said to be redeemed by the blood of God, whom the Elders and Officers are required to attend; But the Apostle requires them to attend all the flock without putting difference between person and person, *ergo*, all the flock, *i. e.* every one of the Visible Church are of that Church which is said to be redeemed &c. Answer. What ever might be said of his Interpretation of the flock to be the Visible Church as Visible, we deny the necessity of the Major Proposition.

on. The flock as it is the object of the Ministers external charge and administration of Ordinances, may be of a larger extent and comprehension; then is the signification of the Church as it standeth under that attribute of being redeemed by the blood of God. And that you may see that is not my conceit, see it expressly given by worthy and Learned *Whittaker*, in answer to *Bellarmine* proving that the Church is Visible from this very Text, *de Eccles. 9. 4. c. 2. Resp. ad locum. 5. particulares Ecclesia* (such as was *Ephesus*, of which the Apostle is speaking) *Christi Religionem proficientes, dicuntur Ecclesia Synecdochica, propter sanctos nimirum & electos, qui in iis sunt, sed quia Pastores non possunt electos a reprobis discernere, itaque totum catervam pascere, regere, curare debent, & iudicium Deo relinquere.* where it is evident, that this Learned Author understood, that that whole Congregation or flock of the *Ephesians* which the Pastours are required to attend, is called that Church which is redeemed, not properly, but synecdochically, because of a part of it; and that is in effect as much as to say, not the whole flock, but a part of it, is the Church redeemed by the blood of God. The second argument may upon this ground the Elders should not know more. To say it, with reverence to the memory of the Author, is clearly to any body of common judgement, exceedingly weak; (For, 1. How followeth that, if the Church redeemed by the blood of God, be the Elect only, then the Elders should not know what their care was, nor upon whom they should bestow it; for it must have this for a reason of it; that Church which is said to be redeemed is the only object of the Elders care, which they are required to attend. This we deny, we say they are part of it, with *Whittaker*. 2. How weak is that, they might reply, we cannot search into thy secrets to perceive who are Elect—and therefore we cannot tell how to feed them. Then it seems by the Reverend mans reasoning, when our Lord laid that charge upon *Peter. Joh. 20. feed my Sheep, my Lambs*; which are no other, but these same he speaks of; *Joh. 10. 26, 27. i. e. only elect ones, v. 27, 28, 29.* he might have replied, Lord I cannot search thy secrets to know who are these thine elect; and therefore I cannot tell how to feed them. It is not necessary for a Pastour to feed the Elect, that he know distinctly who are the

the singular persons by the head; but for feeding by publick Doctrine, it is sufficient that he know them confusedly, that they are there in the Congregation; and if he have any grounds of a positive judgement concerning particular persons; that indeed gives him further advantage to apply himself to those in a more particularly applicatory way. If indeed it were the Ministers work to feed *efficaciter*, to give the increase (as the Apostle expresseth the actual efficaciousness, or efficiency of grace) and they were required to feed the elect that way (I confess if the Lord did not distinctly point out the particular persons to them; then they might make such a reply, Lord I cannot search into thy secrets to perceive who are these, &c. but the efficiency of grace is in Gods own hand alone, and the Minister has upon him but an externall, morall, suasive administration, which he is to dispense for the good of the elect, but he needeth not for that know them distinctly, it is enough, he knowes they are there, where he dispenseth them, and let God discern and waile them out from the rest. 3. It is a groundlesse supposition, and contrary to the truth, that in the current and common sense of Scripture, that *redeemed* being spoken of spiritual redemption from sin, and eternall wrath, (as for the name [*Justified*] it is not in this text, and therefore is impertinently brought in here): is taken for *redeemed visibly*, though not *really*. I doubt he can bring many passages of Scripture, wherein it can with any appearance be so expounded; yea *visibly redeemed*, is an expression in my judgement strange to Scripture: Let this suffice us in answer to Mr. Hooker in this particular: We doubt not but Mr. Rushworth, will have more full and accurate considerations on it.

- §. 10. I shall adde a word or two for prooffe that by the Church redeemed by the blood of Christ cannot be understood all and every one of the Visible Church, but only the Elect, desiring Mr. Hooker to take the same to his consideration; if the Church which *Ephes. 5. 25, 26, 27.* Christ is said to have loved, and given himself for, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it, be not the Visible Church as such, and so all members of the Visible Church, then neither is it so to be taken here; the consequence and connexion of this proposition, is necessary and clear, because the attribute enunciate of it, in both places is all one upon the matter; for what else is it, that Christ loved

loved the Church and gave himself for it, that, &c. but that he redeemed it by his own blood; But that, *Eph. 5.* by the Church is meant only the elect, *i.e.* the Invisible Church, is the constant Doctrine of all Orthodox Divines in their disputes against the Remonstrants universall Redemption, for the Redemption of the elect only, and likewise of all Orthodox Divines writing against Papists, on the Question concerning the members of the true, Invisible Church, the Mysticall body of Christ, and also upon the Question of the Visibilty of the Church: I instance but a testimonie of one, *viz.* Learned *Whitaker*, de *Ecclesi. 9. 1. v. 9. terr. ung.* where you shall find him not only affirm, but solidly prove this we say, reasoning thus from the place: Christ is not the Head, but of that Church which he shall save, which he shall present to himself on the day of Judgement, glorious, not having spot or wrinkle: But only the predestinate shall be saved; Ergo, only the Elect belong to the Church of Christ, *i.e.* the Church mentioned there; and to *Bellarmin's* answer, that Christ is Head to that Church which he shall not save, he saith, *falsissimum esse*. Read that whole paragraph; and you shall find sundry other solide Arguments brought by him from that context, to prove that only the elect are that Church spoken of there. Again I desire him to look forward from *v. 28.* to *ver. 30.* of this very *chap.* of the *Acts*, and see what the Apostle saith, *also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away Disciples after them*: Whether we expone of your own selves of the whole body of the Church of *Ephesus*, or particularly of the Elders and Officers thereof, is all one to our purpose: It will not be denied that the Officers were members of the Church of *Ephesus*, and as Christians were partakers of the common Priviledges and Titles competent to the Visible Church; now if *Paul* shall be conceived to speak, that redeemed by the blood of Christ (let it be out of the positive judgement of charity, and so far as he could judge) universallly of all the Visible Church of *Ephesus*; how could this consist with what he saith, *v. 30.* * that he knew there was some amongst them presently fostering secret and clandestine wickednesse, who would afterward openly kyth, apostatize from the truth, and become seducers of others. Could the Apostle have a judgement

* This is to be understood of such headship as has allusion to the head of the natural body, which hath a real influence in to the body; so to doubt Christ is an head, in a political sort to the Visible Church; having a morall influence, by command, &c.
* Surgenti verbo, qui utitur, significat tam loquere illas sive clandestine peccantes sive occasione sibi data erumpant, Ceterum, such in loc.

such as is mentioned, of such that they were Redeemed by, See Sure, understand the Word, v. 10. as Mr. Lockier would, and we shall have clearly contradictory judgements of Paul at once: I judge the Church of Ephesus Universally, all and every one of you Redeemed; and yet I know some among you are lurking traitours who will kyth afterward: he sayeth not, *may be* some of you will; but *positively* some of you will.

§. 11.

For the Church of the *Philippians* is cited chap. 1. v. 6. and chap. 4. v. 15, 16. For the latter, I see nothing in it that hath any colour of a ground for his point, nor yet doth the former hold forth a proof of it: The Apostle writeth to all the Saints at *Philippi*, and v. 6. declares the confidence that he had, *that God who had begun the work in them would persevere it to the coming of the Lord Jesus*. Will it follow hence that all and every one of the Visible Church

* The 6. *vers.* by the Orthodox writing against the Remonstrants upon the head of perseverance, is applied only to the Elect and true Believers, in the judgement of verity, or truth of the thing itself. See where that particle is put in, though the act of judgement be lesse *Amef. Conf. an. 5. 67g. 24* proving this by solide reasons. of *Philippi* were reall Saints so far as man could judge, * no Logick will evince this from these words cited: If he had taken in the 7. *vers.* he might had a fairer shew of an argument, *even as it is meet for me to think so of you all, because I have you in my heart, in as much as both in my bonds and in defence and confirmation of the Gospel ye all are partakers of my grace.* Here indeed I acknowledge is a judgement of charity passed upon them all at *Philippi*, as truly gracious; and such as God would perfect his Work in; and thinks not that it can be expounded so as to be understood only of that whole Church collectively: for as it is well marked by judicious *Amefius* on the place now cited, the Apostle in this v. putteth in the Universall particle *All*, which he hath not in the former, wherein he expresseth a certain assured judgement of faith (*προσδοκῶντες αὐτὸ ἵνα*, being perswaded of this very thing) of perseverance of these he speaks of, and therefore that being spoken indefinitely, this must be understood universally of all and every one of them; it is very evident that in the following *vers.* See where that particle is put in, though the act of judgement be lesse *Amef. Conf. an. 5. 67g. 24* proving this by solide reasons. of larger extension and must be understood of them universally. Then will you say, do you not yeeld the point in contraversion, to Mr. Lockier. *Ans.* No wayes: 1. Remember what

what we said, the main point which Mr. Lockier should have proven to make out his generall Doctrine or *Thesis*, was, that these particular Churches did gather, that is, receive in persons to their visible society, *formally* upon this account, and no otherwise, that they were truly Godly so far as men could judge, or as others say in the judgement of charity; But all that I grant here of the Church of *Philippi*, is that they were all such *de facto & quoad eventum*, and no more can be proven from the Text. 2. Though this much be granted of this Church, yet his induction is not made out, no, not as to this much: Because neither hath he proven, nor can be proven so much of the rest of the Churches which he named: Yea this is only the Church mentioned in the Epistles that hath so high and generall commendation as this, except it be that there is an hint of the like title given to the Thessalonians, *1 Thess. 5. v. 5. Ye are all the Children of the light*. Yet this expression is much different from that spoken of the *Philippians*, and may well suffer that exposition given of it by the Learned *Nether-Dutch* Interpreters in their notes; ye are all, namely all who believe in Christ. And indeed it is not likely he should be interpreted to speak so of all and every one of the members of that Church, seeing he not only intimateth in both the Epistles, but in the second positively affirmeth, that he heard there were among them some that walked disorderly, working not at all, but busie bodies. *Obj.* But he bids them not keep company with them, that they may be ashamed, *i. e.* as some expone it, Excommunicate and cast them out of the Church.

Ans. He requires not this to be done to them, but in case of obstinacy: Now I suppose they had not proven obstinate, but left that disorderly walking, in taking themselves to work for their living in some calling, so they would escaped the infliction of that censure; but would that been ground sufficient presently to hold such who had been so walking before, for truly gracious so far as men can judge? I doubt much if any man will assert it.

Mr. Lockier slips the *Colossians* in the proof of his induction, but what might been alledged of it, is alike with what was cited for the *Ephesians*. For the Churches of the Jews first concerning that at *Jerusalem*, he referreth back to what he hath said already out

of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; and we refer the Reader to what we answered thereunto. Next for them altogether he citeth, *1 Pet.* 1. 2, 3. *1 Pet.* 5. 13. with *Gal.* 1. 22. And then to the *1 Thess.* 2. 13, 14. and then addeth, *the Church of the Jews were such Professors, as endured persecution sharp tryalls for the truth; and were eminently exemplary to the World this way; as indeed Profession did then generally expose unto, though now not; and so voluntary Profession there—signified a great deale more than the forced Profession of the Gospel, which now we make, under such powers as call for, and countenance these things, doth; which should be observed, and allowed by them, which compare Profession then, with Profession now, if they dealt equally in this Controversie.*

Ans. 1. The Apostle Peter clearly writeth to the Elect, truely regenerated, who have obtained the like precious faith with himself, are kept by the power of God to salvation; rejoiced in the hope thereof, though they had not seen Christ yet loved him, believing on him, rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory, already (in the first fruits, and undoubted interest) received the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls. What? Are these things that use to be given or attributed to hypocrites (such as Mr. Lockiers Visible Saints may be) and that in such a positive way? Or were there never a hypocrite in these Visible Churches of the Jews? 2. The place of the *Thessalonians* speaks of the Churches in *Judas* indefinitely and collectively, not universally; saith not that all and every one of them endured such persecution and trials; again, suppose they did so after they were Church members, this is nothing to the point in hand; the Question is upon what account they were taken in. It seemeth he saw this, and therefore subjoyneth that *Profession did then generally expose unto such tryalls*. But undertaking of a profession of Religion exposing to trials, if there be nor actual assaulting, is no sufficient ground or evidence positively to hold a man truely gracious so far as men can judge. 3. Such wonders and signes as the Gospel was accompanied with then, may be as forcible to draw men without change of heart, unto the profession of it (as we see in *Simon Magus*) as a Magistrate call and countenancing of it, when there is no such miracles and signes; and therefore there is not such inequality between profession

session then and now, nor such inequall dealing in comparing the one profession with the other as Mr. Lockier imagines.

After this induction neither full in the enumeration (for there ^{5. 13} be other Churches in the New Test. mentioned beside these, as the Churches of *Asia*; beside *Ephesus*, Rev. 2. and 3. which I think he did forbear to bring in his induction; because their case would spoken too clear against his undertaking) nor made good in the particulars, as to the thing affirmed of them, he formeth an objection at his own pleasure against himself, and assayes to answer it; Let us consider both,

If it be objected (sayeth he) that there were wicked persons in ^{5. 14} these Churches; therefore we may constitute Churches now in the dayes of the Gospel with good and bad, with truly good and seemingly good, such as make onely a profession, though we know nothing of the power of Religion in them. To this I Answ. 1. Will you with *Anabaptists* have the Church under the New Testament constitute onely with truly good, and not at all with seemingly good? this indeed is your frequently repeated assertion in this lecture; But first, 'tis contrare to the expresse judgement of some of the most judicious and advised of your own side, how often hath Mr. Hooker this, that these of whom the Church is constitute may be *seemingly good, not savingly, nor really, gilt not gold, Saints* in the judgement of charity though they be not inwardly sanctified. 2. It contradicts himself in his additionall qualification, which sometimes he inserteth *as farre at least as men can judge*. Well then, a Church Visible now in the dayes of the Gospel may be constitute of any who are truly good as far as men can judge, but many such are but seemingly good, and really bad; for mans judgement cannot discern the power of Religion in the heart, neither intuitively, nor yet by discourse from outward effects infallibly, but only probably, *cuius iudicio potest subesse falsum*, it may be deceived and the object of it is but *quidam* which seemeth but is not alwayes what it is judged to be. 2. We forme not our objection so naked and waterishly as you make it, there were wicked persons in these Churches, therefore, &c. But take it thus and answer it then: In these Churches, at least severalls of them, there were persons, whose wayes were such that they could not positively

positively be accounted so far as men could judge, truly gracious, such as God could bear witness to as sealed for his by his holy Spirit, and the Churches are not required to un-Church and Excommunicate any upon that account, that they were not such, as might be so accounted and judged of, &c. *Ergo*, &c. But this is not the onely objection we have against this inductive argument, he may find some others before this. Now to his answer.

§. 15. 1. Sayeth he, *a facto ad jus non valet argumentum*, because such things are, therefore they ought to be, will not hold: Because had men were in the Churches, the generall state of which in such a time of the world, John speaks of Rev. 11. 1, 2. therefore they should be there, will not follow; for then why is John bid cast out that which is without, and not measure it, what is allowed to abide, is rather the Index, shewing what is the allowed and proper matter, the true constitution of Church-state. *Ans.* Here are a heap of things to be noted. 1. If that maxime hold good *a facto ad jus non valet argumentum*, because such things are therefore they ought to be, will not hold; then Mr. Lockier, your inductive argument for any thing alledged in it falls to the ground without force; for all that you have alledged in it is a matter of fact; and therefore I may retort upon you thus: Because these Churches did consist of persons truly good so far as men could judge (which is the only thing you can alledge from what is said in the Epistles to them, and yet proves not) therefore they should consist of such only, and no other, will not follow. 2. You wholly loose your Argument taken from them again if you grant but that *a facto* there were other persons in them then truly goodly so far as men could judge, at that time when the Epistles were written to them. For unlesse you assert that at that time they were constitute of persons all such, you alledge the Epistles to no purpose, because the Epistles speaks to them with relation to that very time they were written in. 3. It is rashlie and inconsideratie said by Mr. Lockier, without exception, limitation, or qualification, (especially he being now speaking of matters of Religion) *a facto ad jus non valet Argumentum*, why, then let all Arguments which Orthodox Writers have brought from the practice of the Apostles and Primitive Churches registrate in Scripture to prove they ought

ought *de jure* so to do, as in the matter of sanctifying the first day of the Week as the Christian Sabbath, and many others in other matters, be casten asinull. If Mr. Lockier say this, he shall gratifie much the Papists for their Doctrine of the necessity of unwritten traditions; but shall be disclaimed in this by all Protestant Divines, who give us sundry cases in matters of Religion, wherein it is good and solide reasoning from facts and practises registrate in Scripture, to duty; so such persons did, and therefore so ought we to do; especially in matters of Church Government hath this way of reasoning place; the Lord having left many things belonging thereunto, only in examples of practises (let the Reader see concerning this purpose the Authors of *ius divinum* of Church-Government, part. 1. cap. 4.) from which we are to gather and take our rule: Now amongst other rules belonging to this head, this certainly is one, what was the practice of Primitive Churches, registrate in Scripture, in matters of Religion, of common concernment to the Churches in all ages, and is not disallowed nor disapproved in them, especially when many other things are reproved in them, nor is against a generall precept otherwise in Scripture; such a practice hath the force of a rule; and we may well reason *ab hoc facto ad ius*. See Perkins, *Heb. 11. 6.* pag. 10 fol. 29. col. 1. A, so they did, therefore so may we lawfully. But I assume, these Primitive Churches, admitted and retained members, all of which were not truly Godly and Saints as far as men could judge, and were not reproved for this, even when they were reproved for other things done by them; Nor can their be a generall precept shewn in the word contrary thereunto, Ergo, &c. 4. What may seem to be alledged by him from Rev. 11. 2. as containing such a generall precept, is sufficiently discussed before. The intencion and scope of that place is not to hold forth a rule concerning the ordering of the constitution of the Church, but to foretell an event that was to come to passe upon the Church in time of Antichrists prevalence; that which is without signifieth not persons, but the face & outward state of the Visible Church, and casting out is not un-Churching of persons, but judiciah giving up the outward state of the Visible Church to Antichrist and his followers, and by measuring there is not meant regulating.

gulating of the constitution of a Society, but a typical prediction of the straitness that Orthodox and Godly Worshipers were to be at that time redacted unto. 5. But what meaneth Mr. Lockier, when being about to infringe the objection brought against his induction of these Churches, (*viz.* that there were wicked persons in them) and saying that because bad men were in the Churches it doth not follow, therefore they should be in them, he casteth in that, *the generall estate of which in such a time of the World John speaketh, Rev. 11. 1, 2.* what meaneth he, I say, by such a time of the World wherein the generall state of the Churches were such? if he mean that time wherein the Epistles were written to the Churches. 1. That passage of the *Revelation* is impertinently alledged; for, be the meaning of it what it will, it speaks in relation to another time, long afterward to come. 2. It is certain 'tis the alledgeance in his own induction that these Epistles importe that then they were all constitute of truly good ones so far as men could judge, if he mean another time then that, he speaks this as impertinently; for the objection speaks of these Churches in relation to the time when the Epistles were written to them.

2ly. Saith he in his answer, *Churches may be negligent, and not so strict to their rule to examine and prove the grace of God in such as offer to joyn themselves, as the Church of Jerusalem did, If Churches do not mind diligently their rule, they may have evil persons among them enough, and yet not be able to maintain that it should be so; 'tis like the Asian Churches, and most of the first, quickly after the Apostles time grew faulty in this kind.* Ans.

1. Reader, see here pretty Logick: Mr. Lockier in his induction undertook to prove and conclude a rule from the examples of these particular Churches, that because these particular Churches were constitute of persons truly good, therefore all Churches ought to be constitute only of such persons; it is objected, there were many other persons then such, in these Churches; and now he answereth, *Churches* (he must apply it to these Churches, else he is *extra oleas*) may be negligent and not so strict to their rule; is not this a running in a round? These Churches were constitute of such members, *Ergo*, so ought all Churches generally to be, if they were

were constitute of any other, it was because they were not strict to their rule, i. e. in plain Language, because they were not constitute as Churches ought to be. 2. But let go this, and the inductive Argument; for it is clearly quize here, and refuge had to the general rule. May where is that rule of examining and proving the grace of God in such as offer themselves to joyn, that they were not so strict to as they should? And where have we an instance of the Church of *Jerusalem* greater strictnesse to that rule then these other Churches? Thus to set down naked assertions, is it not to despise hearers and Readers? 3. To what purpose do ye speak of the Churches of *Asia*, and other first Churches their practice after the Apostles time? The objection speaks of these Churches even as they were when the Apostles were living and did write to them these Epistles, out of which you labour to instruct your induction of them.

3ly. Or Churches (saith he) though very diligent and duty strict in this matter, yet are not infallible, and therefore hypocrites may deceive a Church for a time, and so get in where they have no right to be; the Apostle *Jude* doth confesse so much, v. 4. not only persons may thus creep into the Church, but also into office, and still escape the first judgement made upon them by the Churches of which they are. The Apostle doth intimate this to *Timothy*, lay hands suddenly on no man, and his charge on this may make a man tremble, 1 Tim. 5. 21, 22. We are, as appears by this compared with other Scriptures, to use all care as much as in us lieth, to prevent by the first judgement of the Church, all that are not godly, from coming to a state to which they are not approved by God, but if men by subtilty creep in where they should not be, they are to be cast out by the after judgement of the Church, which is Excommunication, when it doth evidently appear that they are hypocrites, though not drunkards, and such kind of bodily sinners, which is far lesse simply considered then hypocrisie, which after judgement is an Ordinance to cleanse the house of God and keep it pure. And doth strongly confirme the point I am on, that the water of the Visible Church should be real Saints. Ans. 1. All this is just nothing to the purpose in hand. Mr. Lockier to prove his general Doctrine, that a Church Visible ought to be constitute,

in its matter, of such as are truly Godly, at least so far as men can judge, had undertaken to shew by induction, that these particular Churches were constitute of persons all such. It was objected that they had in them some others. Now here he tells us in answer that Churches not being infallible may be deceived (and consequently so might this be) in taking in such as ought not to be within. Once granting that it was so in these Churches, he is not quite again his alledgeance concerning them in his inductive Argument; and taken him to the generall rule, which was the thing he undertook to prove, and but begs the thing in Question? But to the matter in this branch of the Answer. Then, 2. When he saith hypocrites have no right to be in the Church, or, afterward, should not be there, if the meaning were, that men, though they make a profession of Religion, yet continuing hypocrites and gracelesse in their hearts do sin in adjoyning themselves to the Visible Church and that they have no right *in foro interiori* this we should not deny; but if his meaning be, that no hypocrits have a *jus Ecclesiasticum* and *in foro exteriori* to be in the Visible Church, we deny it, and he shall never be able to prove it. 3. 'Tis true that Jude saith, that such men creep in unawares into the fellowship of the Church, who afterward kythed to be such, as I shall not deny, they ought to have been casten out: But Jude saith not, that these when they made a Profession of Religion, and did not vent such abominations, had no *jus Ecclesiasticum* to be admitted by the Church into their fellowship. 4. All that Mr. Lockier here bringeth in concerning admitting persons into Offices in the Church is idly and impertinently alledged to the point in hand: We acknowledge that none ought to be put in such Offices, but such as give evidences of all manner of godly conversation; We have an expresse and full rule for this, *1 Tim. 3*. And hands ought not to be laid upon any man, without a foregoing tryall and prooffe of these things. But where will ye shew us in all the Scripture from the one end to the other such a rule requiring such qualifications in persons, and such a tryall of them before, and in relation to their admission into the fellowship of the Visible Church; And to be under Pastorall care and the Ministry of the Word? If he could shew us this, either in precept or approved practice, we should

should soon yield, and be at an end of this controversy; But this he cannot, nor ever will be able to shew, and therefore the reasoning from the ease and security to be used in saying persons who are *dead* in the Church, in relation to admitting them to places of office, and admission of persons into the Society of the Visible Church, is unreasonable. 1. When he saith that they are to be cast out by Excommunication, when it doth evidently appear, that they are hypocrites though not drunkards, &c. I answer, 1. That it may be observed that an hypocrite may be taken in a double sense. First, for such an one as professeth and knowingly receiveth a Profession of Christianity, and so indeed is nothing else but an hypocritical stage-professor. Secondly, more largely for any that hath a profession of Christianity, who may be both morally serious, but hath not within a Principle of true supernatural, living grace. Such are all unregenerate persons in the Church, such in one way that young Man in the Gospel, whom our Lord is said to have loved, and the Lawyer of whom he said, thou art not far from the Kingdom of Heaven. Now if we speak of hypocrites in the former sense, if men appear to be such, I shall confesse that if they have been within they are to be cast out by Excommunication, yet in the order that Christ hath prescribed, after due admonition and evidence of obduracy and incorrigibility in the evil, and of this I shall say more, then Mr. *Lushier*, viz. that it is far greater, not only then drunkenness, and other such bodily sin, simple in *generis peccatis* in the nature of sin; But, if it evidently appear, also in *generis scandalis* in the nature of scandal (which is the ground and consideration upon which censure proceedeth) because it is a very mocking of God in the highest degree. But if we speak of hypocrites in the latter sense, We deny utterly that every man appearing to be such is to be Excommunicated and cast out of the Society of the Visible Church. If a man profess seriously Religion, submitting himself to Ordinances, though there were no penitence, yea though it were revealed by God, that yet he were not Regenerate, and indued with true supernatural Grace, May such an one were not to be excommunicate; Let Mr. *Lushier* shew any for him, shew a warrant of Scripture for Excommunicating a man for non-regeneration. The Doctrine of all Orthodox Divines

vides hitherto, concerning the object of Excommunication, and that grounded upon the Word of God, is that which is shortly expressed by the Learned and Reverend Professours of Leyden Synagogue, thus. *Objection capta quod excommunicetur hoc disciplina Ecclesiastica sunt illi qui fratres nominantur; causa vero est vitia prava vel Doctrina perversa, nec ideo statim, nisi qui frater nominatus in injustum scandale incidit, a corpore Ecclesia excludi debet, quomodoque quibusdam inculpatis in usus est. Sed post privata et deinde publica Ecclesia admonitiones contempnas & repellas, sicut Christi verba aperte significant, Mat. 18.]* disp. 42. thes. 15. 46. And though drunkenness and such like bodily sin be less than hypocrisy in this sense, i.e. non-regeneration, simply, and therefore proceed in the nature of sin, yet it is not less in nature scandalous, in the kind of scandal and offence unto the Church. Nay this hath not the nature of scandal at all. 6. Yet Mr. Lockier according to the genius of his Doctrine ought to say not only men, *when it doth evidently appear that they are hypocrites*, but even if it *doth not evidently appear that they are truly pious*, and we cannot discern in them the power of Godliness, they are to be Excommunicate. For his Doctrine is that none are fit either to be admitted or permitted to constitute a Visible Church, but such as are truly Godly so far as men truly Godly can judge and discern. I believe most of the Independent way will disown him in this. 7. Excommunication is an Ordinance to keep the house of God pure and according to what it ought to be, *in point of duty, in foro exteriori*, and in order to salvation, this we grant only in this sense, that it is an Ordinance tending towards this as a means, (for this is an end of Excommunication *that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus*), but not in this sense that the Church is obliged thereby to effectuate it *quod est divinum*, this belongeth to God alone. Excommunication is an Ordinance to keep the Church pure and according to what it ought to be, *in point of qualification in foro exteriori*, in order to external Visible Church-state, *even quoad externum*; but now what this qualification *in foro exteriori* in order to Church-state is, is the thing in Question. So Mr. Lockier in his reasoning from Excommunication to his Doctrine, either alledgeth nothing to the purpose

purpose, taking his antecedent in the former sense; or begs the Question, taking it in the latter. 8. In the conclusion as proposed here: First note, If only real Saints be the proper matter of a Visible Church, and saving grace the complexion of it: when all Saints so far as men can judge, are not fit matter: for these are not necessarily real Saints, simply. 1. When as he saith, *not one known to be otherwise*, he should have said *unanswerably* to the former words, *no not one*, not known, so far as men can judge, to be such. 3. [*Can justifiably enter*] may be conceived either in point of duty incumbent to themselves who enter, and so the meaning is this, men joining themselves in the Visible Church and making profession of Religion, without true faith and repentance, are not justifiable in this before God; or it may be conceived to be spoken of the Churches, as the admission of men into externall Church-communion; and the sense is this, it is not justifiable that men not having saving grace should by the Church be admitted to enter into the fellowship of the Visible Church: It is any thing, certainly in propounding Doctrines, stating controversies, forming conclusions, ambiguities should be shunn'd. We grant the former sense, but the latter is deny'd; and is not yet proven. This much of the induction. Now come unto the fourth way of probation, by reasons.

SECTION VI.

Examination of Mr. Lockyers proof brought under the name of reason.

His reasons are four, which, because they ly loose out of form 1. 1. and are somewhat prolapsly propounded, I shall labour to take up the strength of them, as far as I can see, ingeniously, in form, that we may both with the more shortness, and clearness, in the greater satisfaction of the Reader, consider and answer them.

The first reason, so far as I can possibly see, may be formed into these processes. 1. *The Church Visible is a building, whereof Jesus Christ is the Rock and foundation: Therefore the whole Visible Church and all parts of it, consist of such persons as must be, and hereupon as a superstrudion, vana vana; superstruditi.* 9. 2.

L 2

Eph.

Eph. 2. 20. *And must be among themselves an uniform, congruous building, built upon a congruous firm; v. 21. so as they may stand.* Then supposing that consequent this will be the second process; *But such persons as have not true saving faith, such as Peter, cannot hold and bear upon Christ, nor can they make up an uniform, congruous building that will stand; how can the building stand, whose materials have not a symmetry, but antilogy, and antifraste, not an agreement, but a fighting with the foundation and one another, Ergo, they are not fit materials to constitute the Visible Church.* Ans. Truly this reason, let me say it without offence, is a building that cannot stand, let a man but touch it, as it were with his finger, and it will to the ground. 1. If it prove any thing, it proveth not only, that *de facto* the Visible Church ought to be constitute of materials or members truly endued with saving grace and faith; but also it is no true Visible Church which doth not *de facto* consist of materials all together, *id est* truly in *universitate rei* endued with true saving grace and faith, and then likely there was never in the world a true Visible Christian Church, unless it was that of the eleven after that *Judas* hanged himself, or may be that *A.D. 1.* nor ever shall be in the world. For suppose a Church consisting of members all which may be accounted truly gracious so far as men can judge; yet seeing mens judgements herein are not infallible; some of them, many of them, yea most of them, are not indeed truly gracious and believers; Then say I, according to Mr. Lockiers reasoning here, how can these bear and hold upon Christ who have no faith? And how can that building stand whose materials have not a symmetry, &c. Let men judge of them what they will, and how probably sooner, that helps not; for they want the bond by which they should bear upon Christ, and they have no symmetric one with another. 2. 'Tis grounded upon a meer mistake or false supposition that the building built upon Christ as a Rock and foundation, Eph. 2. 20, 21. is the Visible Church as such: Mr. Lockier saith well, that it is confessed on all hands, that Christ is the Rock and foundation stone; but he could not say it is agreed upon by all that the Church Visible is the building that is said to be built upon that foundation growing up into a holy Temple, &c. Papists indeed say it is the Visible Church, that

that they may draw all the privileges of the Church Invisible, which is the Mystical body of Christ, to the Church visible, and by that means at least to their own stinking whore the Antichristian Roman Synagogue: But Orthodox Protestant Divines have ever maintained the contrary, that it is the Catholic Invisible Church of the elect that is the building built upon Christ as the Rock and foundation stone (see *Whittaker de Eccles.* in many places known to any that hath read him) untill of late Separatists and Independents have joyned with Papists in this, and drawn all the privileges, proper to the Church Invisible, which is the Mystical body of Christ, unto every Independent visible Congregation. Mr. *Lockier* should have proven, and not merely taken for granted, that the Visible Church is the building built upon Christ as the foundation stone, seeing he knew that it was denied generally by Protestant Divines. The Visible Church, according to its visible state is not the building, but the work house wherein the stones are fitted for to be laid in the building and built up. Mr. *Lockier* supposeth in this Argument that the Visible Church, i. e. a particular Independent Congregation must be a standing, lasting house, *quæ non dissolvitur*, which is not to fail and that perpetuity is the privilege and property of it, in this also joyning with Papists, against whom all Protestant Divines maintain that to belong only to the Church of the elect, or if to the Church Visible, not to any particular, but to the universall. We grant then that any Church Visible is defecible and may indeed fall, and that even upon that ground amongst others that there is not an uniformity and homogeneity amongst all parts of it, some are of the seed of the Woman, really good; some be at the best, seemingly good, and really bad, and the seed of the Serpent (and Mr. *Lockiers* way will not make it to be otherways) and we confesse that it is by the finger of God, that any Church is any long (pace kept standing: Yet God will keep Visible Churches standing, for all the asymmetry and heterogeneity of members amongst themselves (as to their inward, spiritual, eternall state) so long as he has a work for gathering and building up his elect amongst them, for whose sake it is that a Visible Church and his Ordinances therein are set up. You will say, but doth not God this by means?

Yea

yea verily he useth means which he blesteth and maketh effectually for that end, to the keeping down of the evils that are in many and would be ready to break out to the undoing of all, as long as he sees means as the Preaching of the Word, exercise of Discipline against sinners; but God never prescribed this as a means for keeping up Visible Churches that no persons should be admitted or permitted to be in the Visible Church, but such as are symmetricall and homogeneall in true saving grace. This is a means altogether unpracticable by men, unlesse God by an immediat revelation should point out the men.

- S. 3. Mr. Lockier for the strengthening of this first reason bringeth in 1 Cor. 3. from vers. 10. thus: *Christ* (sayeth he, it should be *Paul*) doth argue from this medium, that suitable to the foundation should be the building: otherwise such incongruous superstructions will be fired and they which make them, vers. 10, 11, 12, 13. — in which words the Apostle argues as I do, that if Christ be laid as the Foundation-Stone in a building, 'tis good for men to take heed that they make congruous superstructions, least all the building fall about their ears: and see how he applyeth this vers. 16, 17. *incongruous superstructions if it be in point of Doctrine, it maketh incongruous matter, it defileth the Temple of God, destroys it, sayeth the margin: and such will God destroy; for the Temple of God (sayeth he) is holy, which Temple ye are, i. e. such are the Temple which are holy, which have the Spirit of God dwelling in their hearts, and none else.* Ans. 1. I professe I cannot forbear to say that I find Mr. Lockier abuse much Scripture in the little bounds of this Peere, by most impertinent Citations. What is there in this place to the purpose of the constitution of the Visible Church as to its matter or Members? the Apostle here vers. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. is speaking of Doctrines fundamentall and superstructed; and that these ought to be suitable and agreeable to that, what is this to the matter of the Visible Church? Ay, Yes, by Analogy would he say first, because the Apostle useth the same medium and argues as I do, that if Christ be layed as a foundation, &c. Ans. And must they hold Universallie? because one using a medium in one matter reasons cruelie and solidlie, therefore another using that medium in another matter and reasoning that

that same way for forme, must also reason truelie and solidehe? What if this other erre in the application of the *medium*, and if some of his premisses and principles, whereof his argument consists, be false upon the matter? so it is here: The Apostle reasoneth well and concludently upon that principle, that the superstructure should be suitable to the foundation that Teachers should take heed what Doctrines they teach in the Church, because he assumeth well that Christ or the Doctrine of Christ is the foundation-point of Doctrine in Religion, and all other Doctrines are the superstructures; But Mr. *Lockier* assumeth amisse that the Visible Church as such, is the superstructure built upon Christ as the Foundation. The Scripture sayeth no where so, a Visible Church-state, or to be received unto, or to be in the Visible Church state, is not to be built on Christ as a Foundation, but to be taken in under, or to be under the means of being built, either first or in a further degree of advancement, on Christ as a Foundation. But further (sayeth he) *see how he applies this, ver. 16, 17. incongruous superstructions, if in point of Doctrine, &c. Ans.* This is somewhat spoken in the mist, but for ought I can conjecture or conceive, the meaning seemeth to be this; that wrong Doctrines taught in the Church makes persons unholy, and so unfit matter for the Church to consist of; and so destroyes or defiles the Temple of God, which is, as he conceiveth, the Visible Church. And thus he will have the Apostle, v. 16, 17. to apply that which he had been speaking in the preceeding verses. Now if this be not a forcing of the purpose and meaning of these two verses, let any understanding man in the Christian World judge. The plain, genuine intention and purpose of the Apostle in these verses is, to warne and dehort the *Corinthians* from defiling and laying waste the Church, either by corrupt, idle, or curious Doctrine not suitable to the foundation Christ; or by Schismaticall adding themselves to this or that man who were teachers among them (which was the purpose whereupon he began this discourse, v. 4.) or both; and that upon these three grounds. 1. The consideration of the dignity they were advanced to, that they were the Temple of God, consecrated by the indwelling Spirit to him. 2. That such things did defile, and lay them waste. 3. That God would severly

severely punish such as any wayes defiled and destroyed them that were a Temple consecrated to him. Ay but, 3. Saith he, it is *not* the Temple of God is holy, which Temple ye are, i.e. such as the Temple of God which are holy, which hath the Spirit of God dwelling in their hearts, and none else. Ans. 1. Mr. Lockier conceiveth that these words are brought in as a reason why he that teacheth wrong or incongruous Doctrines defiles or defaces the Temple of God: To this sense the Visible Church consisteth of such as are holy, and has the Spirit dwelling in them and none else, therefore he that teacheth incongruous Doctrine, making men in the Church incongruous matter, i.e. unholy, destroys the Temple, i.e. the Visible Church. A most forcible copy to clear shining evidence of the Apostles intent wherein any man that is not blind may see that these words for the Temple of God is holy, are given as a reason why these that defile the Temple will be severely punished of God; the reason of which consequence clearly intimate in the words is, because God will not indure the defiling or violating of that which is holy and consecrate to himself.

Many in loc. non sunt fidelium ceteri.

qui Ecclesie sicut dicitur sem- plum Dei dicitur, sed unusquisque credentium in Christum reputatur ita cognominatum: non partes de for- matione agens Ap- postolus (cap. 12) corpus cu- jusque cre- denti vocat semplum spi- ritus Sancti.

True indeed, such are the Temple of God which are holy and none else? So Mr. Lockier supposeth but without reason or proof. Surely the Apostle borroweth this denomination from the typical Temple of Jerusalem, but that was no type of a Visible Church, but of Christ's Mystical body and every member thereof. And hence I reason thus, the denomination of the Temple of God is such as is competent to, and predicable of these to whom it is attributed, not only collectively, i.e. to the whole society of them; but also unto every one severally *. But if it be taken for the Vi- sible Church it could not be attributed to every member thereof: Every one is it not a Visible Church. 3. If such only be the Temple of God in Mr. Lockiers sense, i.e. a Visible Church, which are holy and has the Spirit of God dwelling in their hearts and none else: he may seek such a Visible Church in the new world of the Moon.

In the end of this paragraph he presents us another Argument equivalent to this first from this that Christ is called the Head, and the Church the Body: In form it must stand thus: If Christ be the Head there must be an homogeneity in the Church to him, he

he meaneth they must be truly gracious, and endued with true saving faith; But Christ is the Head, and the Visible Church his Body. Therefore, &c. The reason of the connexion of the first Proposition is, because else there can be no mutuall derivation from one to another. *Ans.* 1. Protestant Divines will with one consent deny your assumption as Popish, and tell you that it is the Church of the Elect that is the Body of Christ the Head. See but *Whittaker de Eccles.* 9, 1. c. 13. pag. 449. in fol. Yet. 2. For more clear and particular answer we are to consider, that Christ may be said to be the Head, and the Church his body, either in a *politicall sense*, as a King is called the Head of the Common-wealth, and the People are called his Body: Or (to speak so) in a *physicall sense* according to the similitude of mans body. Now we grant that Christ is a Head to the Visible Church, and the Visible Church hath unto him the relation of a body in the former sense, Christ is a King of the Visible Church, and the Visible Church is his politicall Body: But hence it followeth not that there must be such a homogeneallnesse in the Church Visible as Mr. *Lockier* meaneth, that it be endued with true faith and have the Spirit dwelling in their hearts. And as to the reason of the connexion of the proposition, we answer, such a homogeneallnesse is not requisite for such a derivation, as is from a head politicall to its politicall body; this derivation being only morall, by commands, prohibitions and the like morall actings. But Christ is not a Head in the latter sense, (as the head in the naturall body is) to the Church Visible as such; nor is the Visible Church a body to him in this sense, but only *vocatione activa* and in externall profession: Neither is that derivation from Christ unto the Church, whereby it groweth up in the Lord, unto the Church as a Visible Church, or considered according to its visible constitution; But unto the Church Invisible, Internall, Mysticall as such.

His 2d. Reason is thus shortlie. *If the Visible Church be the Church of the Living God, the pillar and stay of truth, and consequently such as should bear up the truth into the World, and be a stay to truth holding it out firmly and faithfully in the midst of all tryalls; and such as in which God lives, and dwells, and walks. Then none can be mater or members of the Visible Church, but real Saints.* 5. 9.

Saints. For why? Doth God live and dwell in dead persons, who only make a Profession of Religion? Will such persons be a stay to truth and the things of God? Will they be a stay to truth idcirca firmamentum, as the firmament to the stars, who fall from Heaven themselves? And so how can God have glory in the Church throughout all ages. But the Visible Church is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of truth, 1 Tim. 3. 5. in which God lives, dwells, walks, Ergo, &c. *Ans.* Mr. Lockier still in this, as in all his other Arguments, shews that in propounding his Doctrine, he added that qualification, *truly gracious so far as men can judge*, but *dicin causa*, and in shew, to avoid for a while the odium of the greatest Anabaptists Tenent, of the mater or members of the Visible Church. For such as may be gracious and Godly so far as men can judge, mens judgement being not infallible in this (as himself confesseth) may be destitute of the power of Godliness in their hearts, and so such as will not hold out truth firmly in the midst of all trials, may be but dead persons, and so such as in whom God doth not live, walk and dwell. 2. As to that first property and character attributed to a Visible Church from, 1 Tim. 3. 15. by Mr. Lockier: First, I would aske him if in good earnest he meaneth that to be a property of a Visible Church rightly constituted in its mater, as it should be, that it will bear up the truth and things of God firmly and faithfully to the world in the midst of all trials? Sure, this is the very thing that Papists* alledge from this place for the unerrabilitie and indefectibilitie of the Visible Church against which all Protestant Divines dispute. Yea it is much more, for Papists attribute this only to the Catholick Church Visible, acknowledging that all particular Visible Churches may erre and make defection, and let the truth and things of God fall down; excepting only the Roman Church, because they make it to be the Catholick Church virtually: but Mr. Lockier acknowledges no Church Visible, but an Independent Congregation, and will have this to be the property of any particular Visible Church, and therefore propounds the subject of his conclusion here thus, *a Church Visible, i. e. any Visible Church*; now let me put him further to it; either there was never a Church Visible rightly constituted for mater from the beginning, seeing all the first constitute Churches.

Churches have made defection and let truth fall down, which if he say, besides that it is absurd in it self, I ask why then did he a little before bring us patterns of right constitute Churches from these first mentioned in Scripture? Or if they were right constitute, how comes it that they made defection and did not bear up and hold out the truth and things of God, but did let them fall? If he answer, that came to passe, because they kept not a right constitution for their mater. I reponse, that takes not away the force of the Question, For that same if it was so was a not bearing up and holding out firmly and faithfully the things of God, and so the Question returneth upon this. 2. But to answer directly to the place; though Interpreters have some variety amongst themselves about the meaning of it: Yet never one of them acknowledges that Interpretation which Mr. Lockier gives, but opposeth it, and refuteth it in Papists: Some indeed expone the attribute *the pillar and ground of truth* much as he doth; but these by the Church to which it is attributed, understand not the Visible Church, but the Invisible of Elect. So Whittaker de Eccles. q. 3. c. 2. *illa quidem Ecclesia quæ est columna & firmamentum veritatis nunquam potest deficere: Sed quod assumit adversarius, illam Ecclesiam esse Visibilem, illud affirmo esse falsissimum: Invisibilem enim esse affirmo & demonstro.* &c. and often elsewhere. Others again understand the subject as he doth, by the Church to be meant the Visible Church of Ephesus, but these expone the attribute *the pillar and ground of truth*, not of what the Church Visible will do alwayes, *de facto*; but what is its duty and dignity, *eligium hoc Ecclesie dignitatem & officium describit: Non autem quod in ea perpetua luce fulgeat.* Gomar. specul. ver. Eccles. c. 2. So Wal. loc. com. de Eccles. milit. Resp. 1. *Hoc dicitur de Ecclesia Ephesina quæ tamen perijt.* 2. *Ergo, respectu officii sic vocatur.* See more concerning this place in learned Gomar. in the place cited also in his commentar upon the Gallatians, c. 3. in the second Tome of his works, pag. 244, 245. where you have an excellent discourse of the diverse Orthodox Interpretations thereof, both ancient and moderne Divines.

For the 2^d. property and character out of the 2 Cor. 6. 16. We Ans. With all Protestant Divines, that it is not the Visible, but the

We passe here Camer. Interpretation of this place, joining these words, pillar and ground of truth, not with that which goeth before, but that which followeth. S. 6.

See *Phila.*
her de Ec.
scel. q. 1. c. 11.
pag. 412.

the Invisible Church, that is the Temple of the living God in which he liveth, dwelleth, and walketh. To omit many other Arguments for proof of this, take but this one from the Text, the Temple of the Living God, in this place, is taken in such a sense; as that it is spoken and predicated of singular persons, severally, as well as collectively and joyntly: But if it signifie the Visible Church it cannot be predicated of every one of the persons severally; each person is not a Temple in this sense, a Visible Church, *Ergo*, &c. *Obj.* But the Apostle is speaking here to the Visible Church of *Corinth.* *Ans.* True, but every thing he speaketh of them, is not for that, competent to them as a Visible Church.

- S. 7. I cannot but wonder much at that wherewith Mr. *Lockier* closeth this reason, and so how can God have glory in the Church throughout all ages? *Eph. 3. 21.* *Ans.* And doth continuation of the Glory of God in the Church throughout all ages, depend upon his particular way of constituting particular Visible Congregations of all true Saints, and a particular Congregations firmness and constancy in holding out the truth? Hes God then not been glorified in the Church throughout the many preceeding generations, wherein there was never heard of Churches so constitute, untill of yesterday Separatists and Independents erected theirs? And yet waile them as well as they will, they shall never get one such as Mr. *Lockier* would be at in this Argument. And how many particular Churches have fallen away, and for their part letten & roth fall?

S. 8.

The 3^d. Argument groundred on *Malachi 1. 11.* must be thus: If the mater of a Visible Church be not persons truly Godly, then there cannot be offered up in Gods house a pure offering, and the Churches of the Gentiles cannot fulfill that Prophecie, *Mal. 1. 11.* For why? Unto the impure and unbelieving all things are so; every mans offering is as he is, let his offering be what it will, let a man make up his offering of never so much cost and worth, yet is it still in the account of God as the man is; if the man be impure so is his offering; But it is contrary to that Prophecie to say the latter, *Ergo*, &c. *Ans.* Mr. *Lockier* himself will not be able to avoyd the stroak of this Argument; no, not by his own way, as some times he expresseth it, for thereby all such as may be accounted truly

truely godly so far as men can judge are to be acknowledged and admitted as mater of a Visible Church; now many of these may be, and undoubtedly are really impure and unbelieving, and so of necessity must their offering be impure. If it be said, yet it is not the fault of the admitters that they do so. *Ans.* That's nothing to the purpose, for whether they be faulty or not, still it standeth good; that by that way it cannot be avoyded but impure and unbelieving will be in the Visible Church, such as cannot offer a pure offering. 2. It reproacheth the dispensation and wildome of the blessed Lord God himself, because he lies not left in his Word a rule and way whereby the Church Visible may be constitute so as that Prophesie and his decree revealed therein concerning his service among the Gentiles may be fulfilled, for he has given no rule whereby the Church Visible may be gotten so constitute as that all the mater thereof shall be persons truely Godly; But there may be and cannot but be, in it many impure and unbelieving who cannot offer a pure offering. But 3. To answer directly, we deny the connexion or consequence of the first proposition; 'tis grounded upon a false supposition, that there can be no pure offering in the Church, unless all the mater, that is, members of the Visible Church, be truely godly. What? may there not be a pure offering to God in the Church, and so that Prophesie be fulfilled of the Churches of the Gentiles, if some in the Churches Visible be truely Godly, though all be not such? Therefore he takes paines without necessity to prove that impure and unbelievers cannot offer a pure offering; that we grant (I mean not this materially, and objectively, for so an impure man may offer a pure offering) he should have proven to make his consequence good; that if all the mater be not such as cannot offer a pure offering there can be no pure offering in the Church at all. If Mr. Lockier say here, that not only the offering of the unbelieving and impure themselves, but also the offering of all that are in the Visible Church-Communion with them, is impure; This is plain and down right Separatism, and is disclaimed of all the pious and learned amongst the Independents, at least in *dogmat*, and is most contrary to the Word of God.

For

§. 9. For further confirmation of this Argument he bringeth 1. *Pet. 2.* 5. but to no purpose for the point in hand, and what he comments on it, is to no purpose. We grant it all, 1. That Christ is a suitable foundation to the superstructure there mentioned. 2. The Stones must be living to make a Spirituall House. 3. That else they cannot be a Holy Priesthood, to offer up Spirituall Sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God through Christ. That the offering and Offerer are one; That the offering may be Spirituall, Holy, and acceptable, the Person offering must be such; That, persons that have but only a profession of Religion, are dead stones: But what is all this to the point? can there be no Spirituall offering in the Visible Church, if all be not such as can offer a Spirituall offering? that's the thing should been alledged to strengthen the former Argument, but is evidently false. If it be said that the place may be alledged by it self, as holding forth an instance of the generall Doctrine that that Church the Apostle is speaking to was constitute of all such. I answer, the Apostle is not speaking to any particular Visible Church, but to all the effectually called Elect *Jews* scattered throughout *Pontus, Galatia, &c. cap. 1. 2, 3.* If it be said, but he intended his Epistle to the severall particular Churches Visible in these severall parts; I *Ans.* True, but it followeth not therefore that every thing he sayeth to them, is spoken of them as a Visible Church, and so spoken of all and every one of them in that state: What is spoken by way of declaration and imposition of duty, may be, is spoken to all and every one; But what is spoken of by way of assertion, as a priviledge or blessing existing, it is not spoken Universally of all and every one in their visible societie; But indefinitely, which may be verified though it be competent but to some among them; Yea, though it were spoken Universally of them all, Yet it would only prove what they were *de facto* and *quoad eventum*, and not what their Visible Church ought to have been by necessity of a command, that it might be a right constitute Visible Church.

§. 10.

The fourth reason must be formed either of these ways: 1. Thus: if the *Jews* be to be provoked by the glory and purity of his Worship and Worshippers, then a Visible Church, 2. Every Visible Church ought to be constitute of such matter, 3. e. Mem-
bers,

bers, as are all truly Godly; But the former is true. *Ergo*, &c. and if thus, then we deny the connexion or consequence of the last Proposition; And my reason, for the denyall thereof is this. Because I may say, if the Churches Visible be *de facto* such that all or most part of their Members be truly Godly, and shining in the Power of Godlinesse, at the time wherein God hath decreed to bring in the Jews, that will be sufficient for provoking the Jews, although it be not constitute by a Rule or Precept that the Church in admitting Members into externall Church-fellowship, admit none but those that are truly Godly. And why may we not say, that the Lord will at sometime, for carrying on a design decreed by himself in the way of the dispensation of his efficacious Grace, make his Visible Church, at least in most part, the Members thereof, better as to the reality and Power of Religion, then he requires them to be by way of Rule, relating to Ecclesiastick proceeding with Persons in admitting them to externall Visible Church-communication. In a word, the futurition of the provocation of the Jews by the Power of Godlinesse in Gentile Professours, proveth only, that God is to make the Gentile Professours such *de facto*, or at most, what they ought to be in point of their duty, for serving and glorifying God: But proves not that they ought to be such in point of qualification *in foro exteriori Ecclesia* and in relation to admission to the externall society of the Visible Church.

Or, Secondly, It may be formed thus; If the Jews shall be provoked to turn unto the Lord, and embrace Christian Religion, by the glory and purity of his Worship and Worshippers, then the Visible Church or Churches (use which ye will now) shall be constitute or consist of such as are truly Godly: But the former is true, *Ergo*, the latter also. And I answer: 1. Suppose the consequent be granted in as large an universality as it can be taken in: Yet it speaks nothing to the Question in hand. Why? Because only of what is to be *de facto & quoad eventum*, by dispensation of effectuall Grace in the Visible Church; And not what ought to be, by rule, of necessity, that the Church Visible may be rightly constitute in its Visible Church-state; and the Question is about this latter, not that former; And dispensations of effectuall Grace are not our rule in this. 2. Nor yet doth it follow of necessity, that

that even *de facto* the Church Visible shall be so constitute, as to its matter in every difference of time, but only that it shall be at that time that the Jews are to be brought in and converted to the Christian Faith. Yea, nor doeth it follow that *de facto* even at that time the Church Visible shall be so constitute in its matter; that all and every Member thereof shall be truly Godly and shining in the manifestations of Purity and the Power of Godliness; but that so it shall be for the most part, and commonly in the Visible Church. I acknowledge that a means of awaking up the Jews to come unto, and imbrace the Christian Religion, will be a more glorious & full Reformation of Christians, both in point of Worship and in point of conversation: Now Superstition and Antichristian Idolatry amongst those that are called Christians (which are these they only see for the most part) is a stumbling block to them that ly in their way at this day, and I will not say, but the impurity and unrighteousnesse of Christians is also a stumbling block to them; Albeit I think they do not so much stumble at this as at the former, considering that, which is well known in the places where they live, how much notour and known unrighteousnesse is amongst them generally, being for the most part most covetous, exorbitant usurers, cheaters, &c. most evidently, the deadeest, formall, slight in performance of their way of Worship (as mine eyes have been witnesses) of any people in the World. Yet I say, I will not deny that this may stumble them, and they, may be, do pretend it also; Therefore *Babylon* the Mother of fornications must, and will down; And the Princes of the earth that have given up their power to that Whore, will hate her & burn her flesh with fire; and the Lord will purge and reforme his Worship, and Ordinances, and the Christian World from Superstition and Idolatry: And I believe also that there is a time coming when there shall be also a more general and shining Reformation of the lives of Christians; & that both these shall concur as means to provock the Jews to fall in love with the Christian Religion, and to seek unto Jesus Christ; But that all and every Professour in the Visible Church shall be truly Godly, or shining so gloriously in the Power of Godliness (for indeed it is not Godliness simply so much, as a more then ordinary

ordinary shining and eminency of; that will be the means of this great work, which Mr. *Lockyer* has not heeded well in this Argument) or that if any in the Visible Church be not such conformably, though otherwayes professing the truth and pure Worship, and living without scandall, shall be casten out, neither the necessity of that effect doth require, nor can there be warrant of Scripture produced to say or beleve that it shall be so.

As for the passages of Scripture brought for illustration and confirmation of this fourth reason, though the very sense of them given by him were granted, they bear no more but what we have granted, that God will by dispensation of providence, punish, destroy and purge out among his Elect in the Church, wicked, idolatrous, godlesse, and profane ones (and this we deny not, but that the Lord now, and then, may be, towards the end more, is and will be doing this) But speaks nothing expressly and directly, nor by way of consequence, of a rule concerning Ecclesiastick qualification of persons in relation to admission into externall Visible Church fellowship. But verily the most part, if not all of them, are but absurdly and violently, contrary to the genuine scope of the Spirit in them, drawn to this purpose in hand; I shall not now insist much upon them; But briefly point out the perverting of them.

For the first, *Esay* 66. from *ver.* 16. to the end, let the Reader be at the pain to read but upon the place, *Calvin*, *Jansen* and the *English* notes, and especially (if he have any skill in the Language) the notes of the learned judicious *Neiber-Darch* Interpreters, and I doubt not but he shall find such an Exposition and up-taking of the sense and thread of that context, as shall fill and satisfie his minde, much different from that of Mr. *Lockyer*, which is but a new cou'd Interpretation by men addicted to the millenarian phancy, and forced upon the Text. I shall only give some little evidence of this; I mean that his interpretation is forced and contrary to the Grammar of the Text.

He, by these spoken of in the beginning of the *vers.* 19. I will see a sign among them and will send thuse abt escape of them, understandeth Christian Gentiles; and then saith the meaning of the words following, is that these refined Gentiles shall be shut unto

the Nations (as he hath said it) to the countries where the Jews are scattered. And thereby these spoken of, ver. 12. *shall declare* his righteousness the Jews scattered through the Nations. And thereby also is that these Gentiles sent abroad unto the Nations, their end and effect here is, that by declaring the glory of God, they shall not only gain the Gentile World, but shall also bring in their Brethren, the Jews: they shall also (saith he) bring in all your Brethren, saith the Prophet. Further, ecc I discover the manifold violence done here to the Text, I would ask Mr. *Whit* what he meaneth by the *Glory of God*, which these *refused* Gentiles sent abroad, where the Jews are scattered, shall declare? For he doth not explain himself in this. Certainly if he hold to his scope, i. e. the illustration and confirmation of his former Argument, he must mean, the glorious reformation of Worship and Ordinances in their exercise, and of professions in their conversation spoken of there as the means which by the light thereof, should provoke the Jews to emulation. Now here, 1. One point of violence done to the Text, (the clear discovery to every body likely he has shun'd by not explaining what he understood by that glory of God) for by the glory of God here, I think no Christian Interpreter will understand any other thing, but the true knowledge of God in Jesus Christ declared by the Preaching of the Gospel, that fame which the Apostle meaneth, 2 Cor. 3. *the glory of the Lord beheld with open face as in a glasse*, viz. in the Gospel, and Chap. 4. 6. *hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the glory of God in the face of Christ*. If he say he meaneth the fame, then I say he passes from the purpose of his Argument, for clearing of which he brought in this. 2. Another clear violence done to the Text is, that he makes an addition to the Text, which he saith upon ver. 10. *shall they only gain the Gentiles world? they shall [also] bring in all your Brethren*. As if the Text held forth two sorts of people gained by these sent abroad through the nations, one sort and also another called their brethren. The first implied in ver. 10. and the other, ver. 20. When as there is not such a thing as *also* in the Text, but the simple copulative *and*, which only completh together these Verbs, *they shall declare my glory and they shall bring*. And so, 3. There is not the least insinuation

inimination of the gaining two sorts of persons to the effect of their labour and pains. But in the end of v. 19 is set down what labour and work they shall declare by bringing in the Gentiles, and v. 20, is set down the effect of that their work, the bringing in of a sort of persons called their Brethren. 3. By these Brethren who are said to be brought in, cannot be understood Jews. (I mean in the name of Jews is now taken under the New Test. in comprehending all that are remaining of the ancient people professing the Jewish Religion, whether of the Tribe of Judah or of other Tribes) my reason, from the Text, is this, because, ver. 21. is set down as a new and unuſual privilege and dignity vouchſafed upon these Brethren brought, that God would also take of them Priests and Levites, i. e. Ministers to officiate in his Worship and Ordinances. Now it can be no new & unuſual thing to take of Jews to be such: for it had been alwayes so; therefore we do conceive, with these Learned Interpreters we named and others, by these Brethren, must be meant Gentiles who are called the Jews Brethren because when now brought in by the Gospel, in regard of faith, they are *Abrahams* children, *Rom. 4.* and Gods Children, yea and are called *Chosen* Children, even while yet not actually called, *ver.* in the decree and purpose of God, *John 11. 52.* I no wise doubt, but the Children of God scattered, distinguished from the Nation of the Jews, to be gathered in, spoken of by Christ, *John 11. 52.* And these Brethren to be brought in out of all Nations are all one and the same. 4. Those spoken of, *ver. 19. I will ſet a Jew among them, and ſend theſe that aſleep among them;* are not of the Gentiles. 1. For that which we ſaid of these Brethren that are brought in by them. If these Brethren be the Gentiles, those sent out to bring them in must be Jews. 2. Clearly, *ver. 19. 20.* these sent forth are distinguished from the Gentiles even the whole universality of the Gentiles, which are set down, 1. Generally *ver. 19. Nations;* then by a particular enumeration or distribution of them according to the severall quarters of the World, East, West, South and North Isles and Continents. See *English* notes on the particulars. Therefore these sent forth must be of the Jews; and it is remarkable that where the name *Israel* and another people or other persons are set down by way of contradistinction, it signifies

such as the people, but the rest of the people of the World distinguished from the Jews. Therefore we conclude with the great say of Christian Interpreters, in these verses is described not the Calling of the Jews, but the Calling of the Gentiles into the fellowship of the Church, and that by these signed and sent forth are meant the Apostles and others of the Jews sent forth to Preach the Gospel among the Gentiles to bring about their Conversion which we see fulfilled and accomplished. *Mat.* 28. 18. *Mark* 16. 15. *Luke* 8. 14. *John* 10. 15, 16. places also cited by the *English* notes to clear this purpose.

S. 15. For that which he hath upon the last words of this Chapter, *ab! let men read & with much dread lay to heart which make doubt of these things we are upon*; as true indeed men especially such as that verse speaketh against, should not, and had they any spiritual feeling, could not without much dread of heart (transgressours against God) read that but when as *Mr. Lockier* in so speaking, suppoeth that such as will not acknowledge his way of constitution of a Visible Church, of such only as are already truly gracious and regenerate, in so doing makes light of the things spoken of in that Text, he suppoeth it without ground or warrant in that place, or any other where in Scripture. The thing that he is upon, and that this Text is upon, are not one and the same. And therefore the things he is on may be made light of, as being but his own, and yet no hazard of the terror of this Text for that.

S. 16. The place *Rev.* 3. 10. spoken to the Church of *Philadelphia* is but abused. For 1. What warrant is there to expone that hour of temptation spoken of there, of the time immediately before the Calling of the Jews? And the Church of *Philadelphia* in a typicall sense of some Churches to be then? 'Tis too much boldnesse to force such typicall interpretations upon Scripture, where the Spirit of God in the Word goeth not before us to warrant us. 'Tis true Reverend *Brightman* has Interpreted all the Churches and the things written to them, as types of other Churches in these latter dayes. But 1. All wise Divines have shewn their discontentment with his conceit as groundlesse. 2. Yet doth not he understand by *Philadelphia* such Churches immediately before the incalling of the Jews, as *Mr. Lockier* fancies, But her expressly named

named some present Churches, which he will have to be dissolved thereby, *Geneva, France, Low-Countries*, and most the rest, even that Church of *Scotland*, (which Mr. Lockier calls an evil vessell that will be broken in pieces) and that because of the order and Government set up in them. 3. The place speaks not here of cutting off Churches, but of trying the Inhabitants of the World. 4. If these Churches typified by *Philadelphia*, are not to be cut off, because of their constitution like us, how comes that it self which was the Patern and in whom this word was spoken in the first instance and place, hath been cut off?

The place of *Daniel*, is as grossely abused. What ground or appearance can Mr. Lockier give us that the Holy Ghost means one and the same time? *Daniel 12.* and *Rev. 3.* in the Epistle of *Philadelphia*? He sayeth by these words, *Daniel 12. 1. It doth plainly appear that this hour of temptation, viz. Rev. 3. 10. will be immediately before the Calling of the Jews* and he doth no more but say it? Learned men and that upon considerable grounds and reasons, have conceived that time, *Daniel 12. 1.* not to be a time after Christs first coming, but before it, the time of *Antiochus* persecution: And must Mr. Lockier make assertion, without reason, that it is a time immediately before the Jews: insinuating he sufficient to obtain belief.

The New *Jerusalem* spoken of, *Rev. 21.* is groundlessly expounded to be the Visible Church of the Jews, as contradicting, grafted from the Church of the Gentiles: And I verily think that it cannot be understood of the Church upon earth at all, ver. 32. seemeth to me to speak this much clearly. The place *Isa. 11. 7.* is also grossely misapplied to the Visible Church of Gentiles to be joynd with the Visible Church of the Jews after their calling, it being clearly, a Prophecie concerning the Universal Church of the Gospel, reaching along from the time of Christs first coming unto the end, as all Interpreters expound it, and the context it self holdeth it forth evidently. And so is the place of *Zechariah* pointed at to be understood. The hint at *Jer. 12. 9.* where that ancient people are likned to a speckled bird, as if thereby were meant, that because that Church in its visible constitution, was mixed

mingled and mixed with the Godly, therefore it is called a speckled one; and that upon this account they were casten off, might seeme a marvellous thing, were we not on a serious matter, and its rather a matter of reasoning, so see Scripture, and so much of it, is wrested: The simple meaning of the words being this; that as a wilde strange bird, of an uncouth colour, coming in among other birds, all flight about it and pursueth it: So because the people were become unworth, estranged from God; wilde, untame, the Lord would rise up the Nations round about to destroy them. But what meaneth Mr. Lockyer to speak here of the casting off the ancient Visible Church of the Jews under the Old Testament, for not constituting their outward Visible Society, of all truly Saints but suffering it to be speckled: Seeing all along this discourse, he has restricted his Doctrine concerning the matter of the Visible Church, to the dayes of the Gospel? As for his inference wherewith he doth, *consequently the allowed matter of a Visible Church*, (Remember we are speaking of Matter allowed in relation to the outward Ecclesiastick Court its proceeding in admitting persons to externall Church fellowship) *now in the dayes of the Gospel are persons truly holy*, we say it followeth not upon any thing you have been alledging in this paragraph: For were all granted, you have been writing out of these places, all comes to this that God sometime after this will bring the Church Visible to such an estate that all in it shall be truly holy, *de facto*. But dispensations of efficacious grace are not a rule of Ecclesiastick proceeding in admitting persons to the outward communion of the Visible Church.

SECTION VII.

A short modest reply to Mr. Lockyers latter use made of his Doctrine.

- S. 1: I had heard oftentimes before this time Mr. Lockyer commended
 I for a man of an ingenuous, humble, meek, sweet spirit: and when
 I read the Epistle of his three Brethren prefixed to this Peete,
 wherein they called him *a soft, sweet whisperer*, I expected to have

have found him such here. But here I am an impartial man who reads his life and application of his Doctrine, may be given out of singularity, and such bitterness vented against men, as tends to keep the truth and to walk before God in simplicity and sincerity, as becometh not any man of a Christian spirit; and the like whereof could hardly been expected to come from the very sons of Babel themselves against any Protestants.

He begins with this, *Take heed then of setting against a Church of such a complexion and constitution, if we then oppose a thing because it is as it ought to be?* To whom do you speak, Mr. Lockier? To us who oppose your Doctrine concerning the necessary qualification of Church members in relation to eternall Church fellowship? Do we by opposing this, oppose a thing, because it is such as it ought to be? Nay, we do but oppose you who sayes the Church Visible, as such, ought to be, even in the Ecclesiastick Court, that which God never said in his Word, that it ought to be, and makes the door of the Visible Church shuttles then ever the Lord made it, and so in effect disclaymes the way allowed by God himself, for ordering his Church, as not wise enough nor accurate enough. Or do we set our faces against a Church of such complexion and constitution as you describe, consisting of all truly godly so far as men can judge? God forbid, and far be it from us, were there such a Church in the world of such complexion and constitution; it should be very dear and precious in our estimation, and we should bless the Lord for the riches and power of his grace bestowed upon them. We wish from our souls, that our Churches and all the Churches in the world were of such a complexion and constitution. And we acknowledge that as it is the duty of every professour in the Visible Church in the sight of God, that they be not only so far as men can judge, but in truth and indeed truly gracious, having true saving Faith, Repentance and Sanctification; So that it is the duty of Ministers, and of every one in the Church, according to their station and capacity, to endeavour by all means instituted by God, that it may be so. But the thing that we oppose is your rigid opinion, that will have no Church Visible at all unlesse you have it of such a complexion, and will have none permitted to enter the society of the Visible Church, unlesse before they be truly gracious,

sealed

led of God by his Spirit: at least giving such convincing evidence thereof, as they may be accounted such, as far as men truly given can discern and judge, and will have all who are not such called out to be as heathens. This we oppose because it hath no warrant in the Word, is contrary to the Word, is obstructive to the salvation of many souls, tender to the ruine of the Christian Church and Religion; But to oppose this, and to oppose a Church of that complexion and constitution you speak of, are much different. Here then first we desiderate ingenuous dealing with us.

6. 3. But what a flood of bitterness followeth upon this? What horrid crimes laid to the charge of his Opposers? and what terrible dooms and woes denounced against them? *They have a meer spirit of contradiction, bordering upon malice and blasphemy, like Jews, who not able to disprove things that were taught, yet would contradict, being filled with envy, Acts 13. 44. A spirit of pure contradiction haunting men, not a spirit of superior light: a tempter shewing men to be poisoned with Sauls spirit, leavened with envy and malice: and out of this do little else, but blaspheme the Tabernacle of God and those which dwell in heaven, which is no other but a spirit of Antichrist. Rev. 13. 6. wherupon is denounced Acts 13. 41. Behold ye despisers wonder, perish, &c. and not wondering at not believing the things that God saith and doeth: no other effect produced by the Word and Works of God brought to their door but despising: and thereupon with the repetition of the former, 1. New denunciations of the curse, Ezra 6. 11. and then here spoken to as heathens (such as he doubteth Duran was: but if he was one, then) cursed by one of their own, high and low of them, one as well as another, as alterers and destroyers of Gods Worship and People, and will have them take this off his hand, as an article of their Creed. Will ye not believe? And then the Prophecie denounced against the Antichrist and his followers, Rev. 19. from v. 11. forward, is applyed to them. Is this the soft, sweet whispering we were told of? Ah Mr. Lockier! my soul is sorrowfull and heavy to think, a man, professing Christianity, a Minister of the Gospel, standing to speak in the Lords sight, and in his Name, should have uttered such a horrid accusation and bitter invective against many, whom Jesus Christ hath interest in, and will*

once at the last day. I beseech you, Sir, returne into your own thoughts, and consider as in the Lords presence. Against whom you have spoken these things, who were the Opposers of your Doctrine nearest to you at that time, and how would they naturally you intended your speech then altered and now altered? Were they not the honest and faithfull servants of Jesus Christ, the Ministers of Edinburgh and other ancient Churches there? Were any of the people of that place so opposite to you in this matter, as the most ancient and holie Christians, many of whom, were in Christ are you or I had a being in the World, and then with them doth not the Godly Presbyterians in the three Nations oppose you in this matter, and the Godly Divines over seas, some of which have positively printed their judgement in opposition to your way? And are all these led by a meer spirit of contradiction, &c.

Consider, Sir, what is the matter of quarrell. Because they oppose your way of outward constitution of the Visible Church, which will permit none to enter or abide in the fellowship of the Visible Church under the care of the Ministers of Christ, but such as are already truly regenerate, as far as the most discerning men can judge, though they wish and endeavour by Prayers to God, by pains upon men, that all in their Churches might be such, and would account it their Crown and rejoicing how many they may have such. Is this to blaspheme the Tabernacle of God, to destroy his Worship and People, a spirit of Antichrist? For which they must perishe, be cursed, destroyed, and all that written Rev. 19. from verif. 18. come upon them? Suppose they were in an error (as it is not an error, but the way of Christ) might it not have passed amongst the Wood, Hay, or Senble, built upon the foundation, but not destroying the foundation, which may burn the builders being safe? Nay but, say you, they maintain one of a meer spirit of contradiction, as did the learned Jews, seeing a great apertesse in many of their Countrey-men to receive the Doctrine of Christ, and they not being able to disprove the things that were taught, yet would contradict, so they, &c. Ah Mr. Lickier! What could the teachers of the Brethren said more boldly, and more bitterly? 'Tis true, some of our Countrey-men have shewn themselves too ready to receive your Doctrine, yet, blessed

As is the
Falsarian
Class.

be God, not so many as you by insinuation boast of. Their few that have done, so I judge not their persons, they will stand and answer for it before their Judge at the last day. Some are now but fulfilling that which they had once prophesied of themselves. But to you here Mr. Larkier: I Suppose they be in an error that oppose your Doctrine concerning the necessary qualification of persons for being members of a Visible Church: What are you to judge them, to do it out of a meer spirit of contradiction, that they are poisoned with *Sarcina*, leaven'd with malice and envy, &c. Would not charity have required that you should have judged, possibly they do it out of ignorance, and not out of malice, against knowledge of the truth. Were these Godly modest men, *Hosker*, *Cotton* alive, they would, and such as are alive of that way, that are pious and judicious will, I am confident, detest and abhorre this your unchristian cruell judging of us. Blessed be God we stand not nor fall at mans judgement we have one that judgeth us, our Lord Jesus Christ, and to him we referre this challenge you have laid to our charge, and, Sir, if you do not repent of the rashness and cruelty of it (which from our souls we wish you may do) we cite you before his Tribunal to answer for it. But, 2. Sir we are content also to stand at the Barre of any impartial, judicious Divines, in the Christian World, and that they give their judgement, by that same much which I (who pretends not to be one of the Learned Men in this Land) have Answered to your preceeding Discourse, if your Doctrine be such as we are not able to disprove, and if we do not upon some good grounds of reason, and not out of a meer spirit of contradiction, oppose the same: And thus I shall leave your invective without saying any more to it: we have not learned Christ so, as to repay evil with evil, bitterness with bitterness, you have cursed us, we bless you, we wish you heartily a blessing, Repentance and forgiveness of this evil thought of your heart and the uncharitable issue of it.

SECTION VIII.

Mr. Lockyers Objections he maketh to himself, and his Answers thereto, considered.

MR. Lockier having discharged that better foregoing invective against the opposers of his way, comes to propound and answer some Objections against himself, checked out, and formed at his own pleasure, Five, in number, whereof the only one is *in causa*. Were there no other Arguments worthy of his consideration, besides these, to be found in Orthodox Writers opposite to his way? If he thinks not; it will seem he hes not read such Writers on this purpose as he might and ought, for clearing of himself and others. If he knew others, why did he not assay to clear them all? I think he had not will to present before his hearers all Arguments brought against his Doctrine, lest he should not ridde his feet well of them, and something thereof might have stuck to such as was judicious. Whatsoever hes moved him so to passe them over, we hope it shall shortly appear, he had some cause rather to passe them in silence; then to fix and grapple with them: It was his prudence so to do: But let's see these he touch and his answers to them.

Obj. 1. Why? But they gather Churches out of Churches whom you plead for. Why? I thought the Disput hitherto ye have been on, was not about persons and their practices; but about a dogmatick point. Had we been propounding Objections to you, we should not troubled our selves with these extrinsecall ones, taken from prejudices against persons, abaters of your Doctrine: But should more directly pointed at the throat of the cause it self. Yet we thin all Godly Orthodox men in the Christian World, besides your selves, will judge that the Godly Ministers of Christ in this Island have just cause to lay this practice of picking out of Orthodox Churches (in which Jesus Christ is soundly Taught, Sacraments administered according to their institution, and are by the most judicious of your own way confessed to be true Churches from which it is not lawfull to make separation) such Professors

as by Gods blessing upon his Ordinances in these Churches have
 gotten most good, so make up of them Churches to your selves.
 All Orthodox Christians will judge this justly laid to your charge,
 and schismatick practice having no warrant or precedent in the
 Word of God, tending to the begetting of heart burnings, dis-
 sensions, hatred amongst Christians, yea these of nearest relations,
 Husband and Wife, Parents and Children, Magistrate and People,
 to the hindring and so wayes to the promoting of the Work of
 Reformation. Else see what is said to this.

9.3.

*NAT. 4. M. But Churches out of a Church: Gospel Churches
 out of a legall National Church, and the one being abolished, there
 may be, yea, there ought to be a departing from it, and gathering
 out of it into the order, which God hath instituted for the same
 Churches gathered out of that Church of the Jew. God. And
 whether he meaneth by leaving in Christ, as in the words of
 profession, (as 1. Thim. 2. 14.)* *Ans. 1.* The continuance of the
 2. 14. for cleaning what is meet to be kept in. *Christ* *meaneth*
God 1. 21. 5. a digression from the purpose of the Ord. 2. 14. and
back has sufficiently answered before. *2.* You gather Churches
 say you, out of a Church, not out of Churches. This is true,
 are not the Church of Jerusalem, and the Church of Antioch,
 Churches? *Ans.* It be a fault to gather Churches out of
 Churches, shall it be no fault to gather Churches out of a Church
major & minor, as was our former. *Ans.* 'tis a legall National
 Church he meaneth, such as the Jewish, such a Church is abo-
 lished, therefore, for no fault, yet we ought to gather. *Ans.* For
 Answer. We may consider a National or Provincall Church of a
 threefold sort and notion. 1. Wherein all of the Nation are
 bound to a publick and solemn typical service, and worship, as be
 performed in one place chosen by God, under the inspection of
 our Visible Pastor or Priest, who in worship and service doth
 hold forth and represent the whole People of the Nation. 2.
 Such a National and Provincall Church, in which many particu-
 lar Churches are united and subjoyned unto one Church (as
 they call it, Mother or Cathedral Church) and depend upon a
 Visible Pastor, who is Pastor and Ruler of all other Pastors and
 particular Churches in the Nation or Province; And wherein the

Inferiour

inferiour Churches enjoy Divine Ordinances and Ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, of that Mother and Cathedrall Church, or that Provinciall or Nationall Pastor, 3. Such a Nationall Church wherein many particular Churches are joyned and united under one Visible Church Government; wherein all are equally and indifferently concerned; and have equal interest for the use and exercise of all these Ordinances, which are necessary to the Visible Ministeriall Government of these Churches, and contract Ecclesiastick fellowship in it, and edification and preservation by it. Now a Nationall Church in the second notion is not, nor ever was an Ordinance of God, but a meer invention of men and Antichristian tyrants, overthrowing the power granted by G. O. D. to the Churches, and Pastors. A nationall Church of the first notion and sense was indeed an Ordinance of God. Such were the Jews, but instituted and continued for a definite time, till the Messiah should come, and then it was abolished and evangelized. And a Church Nationall in this sense was legal. But a Nationall Church in the third sense is not a legal, or typical Church and Ordinance. But *verbalis est, proprius, juris*. Such was the Jewish under the Old Testament in point of Government and Ecclesiastick Discipline. They were many particular Churches, and Synagogues which did in diverse places exercise the Moral Worship of God, and the exercises of Doctrine, Discipline and Church Government. *Act. 15. 21. 14. 23. 15. 16. Luke 21. 22. John 8. 20.* All which were joyned and united under one Nationall Visible Ecclesiastick Government. This Visible Churchship (so to speak) of the Church of the Jews, as it was not legal (lasting permanently) so it was not typical: so neither was it ever abolished. But Mr. *Amos* shewes no Text in the whole New Testament importing an abrogation of it. Nay, we may through *Mat. 23. 34. 35. 36.* etc. mention a church, to give evidence from the Word of God that there is a Church Visible under the New Testament of a larger extent and bound. (I mean in point of Government) then a Province or Nation, even a Visible Church Universal. Therefore I conclude that we maintaining a Nationall Church in no other sense than this, which is still warranted and allowed in the New Testament, is nothing else but good Sense and to gather

gather Churches out of Churches upon this account, because they are united into one Nationall Church in this sense. As to that alledged by Mr. Lockier of gathering Churches out of that one Church of the Jews which he would confirm by Gal. 1. 22. 1. *I say*. The alledgeance is grossely impertinent; for why? We are now upon the practice of gathering and constituting Churches in a new Visible Church-state, of persons withdrawn from Churches wherein is the sound Doctrine of the faith of Christ and pure Sacraments according to their institution (such as the most judicious and Godly amongst the Independent Brethren themselves confesse to be true Churches) upon this account, because they are united into one Nationall Church in point of Government. But now will Mr. Lockier say, that the Christian Churches of the Jews were gathered out of the Jews, upon this account, because they were a Nationall Church in this sense? He cannot upon any warrant in the world. The ground of their gathering out from the rest of the Jews, was because the rest would not believe Jesus to be the Messiah, nor imbrace him as their Saviour: But would still adhere to their ceremoniall Worship, Sacrifices and Priesthood, and would be saved by their own righteousness, blaspheming Christ and his Doctrine.

- §. 4. The second objection he propoundeth himself is this. *These men are full of Heresies and dangerous opinions that follow this way, many monsters come out of your Independent Churches, therefore surely tis not of God, &c.* I must say again Mr. Lockier doth prudently to make those of such arguments against himself to answer, as are little to the purpose in hand. I think no understanding adversary, would have moved this as an objection against his Doctrine, handled in this Lecture concerning the matter of the Visible Church. But I think indeed, being well managed, it may be made use of to good purpose against their Independent Churches in point of their Government. thus, The Government that is set up to open a door to Errors, seemeth cannot be of God. But such is the Independent way of Church Government, which makes every particular Congregation Independent, and supreme in Government, so that if any of them fall into Error, there is no ecclesiastick Power on earth, that authoritatively can interpose or redresse,

redresse wherein they go wrong. And certainly it is by this occasion, many Errors have sprung up amongst them that follow this way. And for this very cause it is, that many maintainers of grosse Errors, as Anabaptists, Antinomians, &c. lay hold on this way of Government as most suitable to their deliquies, and serviceable for their safetie and indemnitie. And here I shall desire Mr. Lockier to remember, how that Reverend Mr. Brightman, paralleling the Churches of Geneva, France, Low-countrie, and Scotland; put the speciall point of their commendation, on the nature and way of their Government, viz. Presbyterian, whereby they have more then any Reformed Churches, preserved themselves, in Unity and Truth, free of Schismes and Heresies. But we will have place afterward to speak of this point of Government. It seemeth to me very likely that Mr. Lockier hath drawn in this objection in this place, namely upon a designe against a Person, as we shall see apparent ground even now in his answer.

Ans. 1. All is not true that is said of Congregationall Churches, and their friends, it hath been an old wyle of the Devil — Nay, I know all is not true which is Printed of Persons honouring and loving Churches of such a constitution, witnesse Master Edwards Gangren, nay Master Rutherfords Spirituall Antichrist, pag. 250, 251. The Lord Generall Cromwell is charged with publick scandall, and unsoundnesse in the Faith, because of a letter to the Parliament, then having set down a part of that letter out of Mr. Rutherford, what Heresie (sayeth he) is in this letter I know not, and then applieth Mr. Rutherford, his constructing of that letter. Pal. 56. 5. and that of Solomon, Pro. surely the wringing of the nose bringeth forth blood. Then cites another speech of Master Rutherfords Spirituall Antichrist, (viz. to my knowledge theres not this day in England any that is a most Independent, which maintaineth nothing but Independence, with most of those of New England, and doeth not hold other unsound and corrupt Tenets, &c.) and sayeth this maketh him veritable, when he comes to speak from whom it cometh. Surely there be many Independents in England to whom he is a stranger; and how thin should he dare to speak of them all as he doeth?

doeth. Especially this makes him resemble, comparing with what Mr. Rutherford hath in his Epistle, if I lift up my hand as a bloody pen, &c. *Ans.* 1. 'Tis a poor and sorry vindication, all is not true that is said, yea or Printed of Congregational Churches and of their friends. That is not the thing you are charged with in the Objection even as formed by your self, that all is true, if a great part or most part of these things be true, the charge abideth good. And true it is that more Monsters of dangerous opinions in matters of Religion have come from Independent Churches and the friends thereof, and have had their recourse to that way of Government, within those few years by past; then I believe has arisen in all the Reformed Churches in Christendome since the beginning of Reformation. As for your bringing Mr. Rutherford upon the stage upon the account of that Letter, you will do well Mr. Looker to enter into your own heart, and consider from what designe and intention this hath proceeded. 'Tis very apparent, it has come from little purpose or intention to clear that Letter in the things charged upon it; Seeing you have not so much as hinted at the clearing of one animadversion on it; But thought it enough to say you know not what is amisse in it, and to bid the world judge of it. Give me leave to say it of Mr. Looker, if Generall Cromwells Soldiers defended him not better with the Sword, then you do here with your pen, it were not very safe for him to go to the fields. Well, I will not determine upon your intentions; But if the intention of the work of this businesse, looketh not towards stirring up of persecution against the Godly and precious servants of Jesus Christ, I leave it to be judged of any indifferent man, considering the posture of affairs in these Lands: But I believe those whom the Authors words tends to irritate, will not be so forward to put forth their hands, as he is to solicit them. The other challenge made against that precious man, is evident, grosse and palpable wresting of his words (the same Mr. Looker had but in that same breath almost charged upon him without giving any evidence of it) and a very winning of the nose to bring forth blood. I report me to every ingenious man, if reading Mr. Rutherford words as they are alleged by Mr. Looker himself,

self, he will conceive that Mr. *Rutherford* meant what he sayeth of all and every Independent in *England*, as Mr. *Locke* instructeth them: or not rather that he speaketh only of all men of his knowledge. And what cause then is there of such out-crying against Mr. *Rutherford* for these words, as if they were a matter of trembling? Verily I cannot but think it a matter of trembling, to see a man with so much confidence and boldness palpably misconstruing in honest mans words to make him odious.

S. 6.

Here *Locke* 3. That there is difference between a cause and occasion. That we walk in a fundamentall truth, in the power of it, many take occasion hence to scoffe, break forth into much wickednesse. Is it not therefore the truth which we follow? And then he telleth us that as light hath broken forth in every age, Satan hath laboured to darken it, and gives instances. As 1. That when the first Fathers began to lay again that great principle and fundamentall of the Trinity, to darken this, he set on foot *Arrian* heresie. — 2. When some of the modern Divines laid that great fundamentall point of justification by faith in Christ, so darken this he conjured up the *Anabaptists* in Germany, which denied propitietie, *Magistracie*; all which is good; and then addeth, now when God hath made another accession of light, respecting the roose and upper part of the house (the Independent way of constitution and Government of Churches) what sturres, fogs, mists hath he raised? Is all this therefore darknesse, drosse? — I think things about which the Devil doth such ado, may rather be thought to have something in them, rather then to conclude they have nothing of God within them: because the Devil doth not usually set against his own: Doth not Satan against the Devil. When the New Heaven, as the Prophet calleth it, this new order was first set up at *Jerusalem*, what floods of light made is there? When at *Antioch* what work made is there? No small edification, *Acts* 13. 2. and yet the mind of God, *Acts* 1. Much more may be discovered already in this lecture of Mr. *Locke*s, but in no one passage hath he worse acquitted himself then in this we have now in hand. 1. True, it is no good argument or prejudice either, against a Tenet or point of Doctrine that many take occasion thence to scoffe and break forth into much wickednesse: But

this is not to the purpose in hand. Our allegiance is that the Independent way of Church-Government is such in the nature of it as *gives* occasion to men to run freely without controulement into errors, and is a kinde of shelter, for such as holds and maintains errors, to run to, as experience proveth; and this sure, if it be not an intrinick Argument yet it is a strong presumption against a *Maner*, that it is not of God, the like cannot be said of the Presbyterian way. 2. As to the two instances brought in. They are as impertinent as the former generall; For neither by the Doctrine of the Trinity was *occasion* given any wayes to the *Arian* heresie. But the Devil raised up *Arian* and his heresie, in *opposi* and *darken* that fundamentall point of Christianity. Nor was there, by the Doctrine of justification cleared by these modern fathers, *occasion given* to the stirres of Anabaptists: But these were raised by the Devil in *opposition* against that and other points of Religion then cleared. I humbly conceive it agrees not well with Humane to say that upon the fathers beginning again to lay that principall fundamentall of the Trinity; the Devil did set on foot the *Arian* heresie: The History of these times seemeth to say that the setting on foot the *Arian* heresie gave occasion to these ancient fathers, to establish and confirm from the Word of God that principle and fundamentall of the Trinity. While *John Lockier* (by way of application of these things noted on before) first sayeth, *now in this period of time God hath made another accession of light, repelling the roofe and upper part of the house* (meaning his Independent way of Church constitution and Government) and then he joyneth by way of Question, *and now what stirres* &c. Why, what now? *Is all this for* ——— he but mislay beg his Question, viz. that his way is a new accession of light. 4. Worst of all doth he plead for his own cause in relation to the former Objection when as he alledges that *it was rather* *to think* *a way that hath something of God in it, which the Devil opposeth*, then to conclude to the contrary because the Devil doth not usually set against his own. Why? The Independent way is that which this day all the children of Satan (I mean not meet Independent themselves, many of whom I love and reverence) and almost all the Sect masters of the time betakes themselves to and

hugges

hugges in their arms. And the Presbyterian way is that which all the errors and heresies of the time opposeth, looketh upon as the great eye-sore and hateth *cane pejus & anare*. 5. This somewhat more than inconsiderat contempt of his hearers and readers; when he will have them beleeve; that it was the setting up of his *Independent Church order at Jerusalem and Antioch* that was the matter and object of the bloody stirres, and no small dissensions there. Ah Mr. Lockier! it was another matter, upon which these things were raised, then who should be members of the Visible Church, or what form of externall Government, should be followed, 'twas the preaching of justification and salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, without the works of the Law.

The 2. *Object*. Mr. Lockier meeteth with, *ill Independency, no such sharp and bloody stirres and dissensions*. Where did you read this brought in an Argument against your Doctrine of Church-members? Will any body say, that these impertinencies were brought on the stage for any other end; but to catch occasion to vent spleen against persons of men; for what else is it that followeth by way of Answer to this.

3. *Presbyterians began first to draw the sword, and their bitterness and hatefulness hath increased; so that, in which otherwise in likelihood, it would not have come.* The two latter *Swiss wars*, have been the sharpest, I know they will say that they have felt. And truly whether their forward spirit did not principally raise these storms, I leave themselves to judge. They converted so many *Malignants into Presbyterians*, &c. & contra, that if God had not been more gracious, then they were angry, they had undone themselves and others too.

Ans. To this important discourse in the generall, if I shall say, that it is nothing else, but an issue of carnall bitterness. I trust no ingenuous indifferant man, will blame me or them. I say too much. For, 1. True, suppose Presbyterians began first to draw the sword, (which is false, they were forced to it by others drawing it) but was it not for their just defence in vindication and maintenance of the Truth of Jesus Christ, and of their just liberty against oppression, Prelaticall violence, and arbitrary Governments? And must this be charged upon them, as Mr. Lockier doth here,

* Remem-
ber, Mr.
Lockier, and
read that
speech of
one of your
own, *Fere-
mie Bur-
roughs*, to
the comon
Council of
London in
Guild Hall,
anno 1642,
and blush.
I shal here
insert but a
few of his
words for
the Rea-
ders sake
who may
be, has not
it hand a
Copie of
that speech,
Was their
ever such
an example
seen since
the world
began, of a
*people com-
ing out of*
*a poor coun-
try into*
a fat and
*rich coun-
try, and*
beating

as a crime? Tell me Mr. *Lockier*, what condition were you in
and would been in to this day, in all humane appearance, had not
Presbyterians begun to draw the sword in that quarrell? Tell me
what was the means under God that procured liberty for the
setting down of a free Parliament in *England*, 1640? Tell me, I
think it was a crime, that you got not leave to touch under-
burden, and Religion, and Liberties were not suffered, for Pres-
byterians, to be still under oppression and usurpation. I believe the
wisest and most ingenuous, and those that are most eminent
amongst them, that now are in power amongst you and in these
Lands, will not approve you in their judgement of this challenge
against us; And unlesse I be misinformed when they were come to
this height of prevalency, they are now in, and we brought to this
low condition we are now continuing in, looking back, gave testi-
mony of their acknowledgement, that our beginning to draw the
sword, did put the sword in their hand, that was never our in-
tense to put it in their hand, for the effect, for which at last they
have made use of it. 2. Your attributing the heightning of the
sword to that, to which indikelyhood it would not have come, to
the bitterness and baseness of Presbyterians, seeing ye give no
proof nor the least evidence of it, (and indeed ye could not,) we
must crave leave to say, it is so to say. Tell me, Sir, was it bit-
ternesse of spirit, or did it tend to the heightning of the sword, that
the Presbyterians in *Scotland*, having but girded their sword to
them, *Anno 1639*, upon promises of tollerable satisfaction, laid
it aside again presently, ere ever they drew it, and having again
the Year 40. being forced to it, by deadly preparations, drawn
it, with advantage which they might have prosecuted, yet is seen
as they were secured by the treaty of *Edinburg*, put it up into its
sheath, and rested again? into that same land without any fur-
ther molestation, and having again drawn the sword for your assist-
ance in great straits, and upon your earnest suit, *Anno 1642*, And
having kept it in their hand for many years untill all enemies were

these opportunities to crush themselves, to go away as they did. These greatest enemies
they now adduce as their. A people that began to rise for their Liberties when the gen-
rality of this people here was ready, &c. I will transcribe no more, let Mr. *Lockier* read
what he saith and what goeth before these words.

hailit

huffit and gone, as soon as they were desired to return home, did it in a peaceable way. I pray you Sir, tell me, who were the men that took up the sword then? Whether Presbyterians, or some others? 3. Indeed these two latter Summer wars have been the trouble, and we cannot but say, that we have felt: And it becometh us well to justify the Lord our God in all that he hath brought upon us, and to bear his indignation, because we have sinned against him. We and our Kings and our Princes and Rulers and the whole People of the Land: But if, as to the quarrell between us and our forwardnesse of spirit in us raised these storms, so we can justify ourselves before the world: Yet we shall not take upon our selves to be judges of it: But shall refer it to the judgement of him, who is the Judge of the World; and though it should be his blessed good pleasure never to plead our cause by a sensible dispensation of providence in this world, yet we will acquiesce in the apprehension of his revealed will, without quiring of our innocency, be content to ly down in the grave, and wait for his sentence in the matter when he shall come to Judge the quick and the dead: And as for your Mr. Lockier, I verily think he shall never let you go off this world without a challenge from himself, for such unchristian, uncharitable insulting over them whom the Lord hath smitten, and talking in derision of those whom he hath wounded: 4. As to that which followeth, *they converted so many Adversaries into Presbyterians, &c. contra, &c.* 1. 'Tis upon the most brutish and injurious scold-melling rank of a mind, not purposed to reason but to reproach, a thing unbecoming a Minister of the Gospel especially in a Pulpit. I will not pay you home in your words, Mr. Lockier, but I may say, *Quidnam dignum ego esse scilicet contumeliosum, et iniquum faceret tamen*— 2. 'Tis utterly impertinent to the present purpose he was upon. Was this the quarrell that did principally raise these storms? Where is iniquity? I beleeve we might have liberty to turn Malignants enough unto Presbyterians or any other thing we pleased, without any quarrell, had we been content but to have done some one thing, which we durst not do because of the Oath of God. And now I beseech you Mr. Lockier, say candidly if either then, when these storms were raised, or now since we felt the blast of them,

converting

converting Malignants to be what they would, for your deligne, he made bones of among you? He insist no more upon this inventive; but leave it spread before the Lord, that he may, at his time, plead with the authors heart, for the injustice and uncharitableness of it. Come we now to the next Objection he presents with.

59.

Object. *Simon Magus was a man in the full of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity, yet upon his profession of faith in Christ he was received into Church-fellowship. Therefore meer profession is sufficient for his state, and none need be looked after de jure nisi ex abundanti.* Hitherto Mr. Lancelot has been pleased to represent his adversaries as impertinent, opposing prejudices against persons, and not reasoning against his opinion, he knoweth himself for what end: Now at last he votes for them the credit of saying some little thing, a word or two in *causa*. As to the former now set down. 1. He wrongs in assuming the conclusion or consequent: 'Tis not any meer profession what's ever we allow as sufficient for this state, admission into Church-fellowship. Some may profess mockingly, hypocritically, or equivocally, on purpose to deceive and subvert the Church, as the 1. Cor. 14. Such profession we allow not; but for such a profession, such as we described before stating the question. 2. We give him the antecedent somewhat more conflicting than, *Simon Magus* having been even now a vile sorcerer, bewitching people with his sorceries, and sacrilegiously usurping the house of God upon profession of faith in a sober seriousness, whereby *Philip* was moved and received into Church-fellowship, without passing any trial, if his profession of his proceeded from repentment, that it did proceed; so far as men could discern, from some living grace and faith in the heart. That his profession was sincere and serious and true, and appeared so, is evident in the Text. For he was brought so it by conviction to acknowledge and considering at the miracles that were done. And the Text speaks not of any intended purpose of deceiving in his taking up that profession. Had that *Philip* tried and examined his profession, if it did proceed from a true living work of Regeneration in the heart, or that judgment was passed upon him as one truly regenerate, so far as men can discern, the

Text

Text sayeth not this, nor any thing to that purpose. Now let's see what Mr. *Lackier* replyeth.

1. Surely (saith he) it was not forms but substance that was looked at, and received indeed to be in this man, so far as man can judge (1. Cor. 13. 12) by his fruit: *ex de occultis non judicat Ecclesia*: There were surely outward signs of repentance in his sin, & such as the Apostle Peter, who received him into fellowship, was satisfied with. And here is a palpable grosse escape committed by the Author, when he attributeth *Simons* receiving into Church-fellowship to Peter: for clear it is, that *Simon* was received in Church-fellowship by *Peter*, and continuing with him therein, some space after Peter and he came down to Samaria. *Acts* 8. 13, 14. whether the Author has committed this escape of inanimadvertencie, or of purpose, I will not peremptorily determine: But the latter seemeth most probable, that he might have the fairer occasion to bring in Peter's words, *Acts* 2. 28. to confirm his Assertion concerning *Simons* qualification in relation to his admission into Church-fellowship, of which place none. 2. But whether Peter received him, that there were such outward signs of repentance in this man, that as far as men can judge of a tree by its fruit, he was conceived, to be a regenerate and a true faithfully believing, and that upon this he received him, it is, that he was received into Church-fellowship, now the Author instructs to prove this.

First, saith he, what Peter required at the hands of those, *Acts* 2. 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; &c. he would, did follow the example of Christ, which he had received and delivered unto us, and therefore required as much at the hands of *Simon*; If he would not dispute with this reason, none of those great sinners (as he saith) there is no reason to think he should exact less of this man, as he saith, in him, especially, what a creature he had been. 2dly. Besides the conditional nature of admitting, *Simons* receiving into the Church to Peter (whereupon so much of the weight of this reason dependeth) there is another great mistake upon the matter, which is the principal ground: and being discovered, the whole inference is overthrowed. Mr. *Lackier* supposeth that the Apostle Peter in these words, Repent and be baptized every one of

you for the remission of sins) is speaking unto these people and prescribing a rule to them for qualification, in relation to stating them in outward visible Church-fellowship: when as it is another matter in relation to which he is speaking and prescribing a direction for *viz.* how they might find pardon of their fearfull sin of crucifying the Lord of glory, be reconciled to God, and saved from the wrath to come: This is evident in the noon day to any that will look upon the context. For this rule and direction of the Apostles, is in order to that which at that time was pressing the souls of these he speaketh to, and to answer the question they propounded out of the anguish of their spirits. Now clear it is, that the matter that pressed them was their conviction of their being guilty of rejecting and crucifying Christ: and their danger of the dreadfull wrath of God; and the question they propounded, *What shall we doe* was not about stating in visible Church-membership: but how they might be freed of that guiltinesse, and saved from the wrath of God. This is it that the Apostles rule and direction relateth to: and therefore 'tis more then evidence of true repentance and faith, so far as men can judge, even true repentance and faith *in veritate et in existentia*, that he requireth of them. This rule in relation to this end, he had indeed received from Christ: and neither could be, nor for any man, differ with it, or extend less from any relation to that end, than appertaining to Mr. *Lockers* purpose; that *Peter* received from the Lord, or followed in the point of admitting into the outward fellowship of the visible Church, such a rule as requireth either true repentance and faith in reality of inwardness, or convincing evidences thereof, so far as men can judge, as the necessary qualification *in form exterioris Ecclesie*, and is the ground whereupon only the Church may admit persons into external Church communion: this the Text saith not, nor any other that he can produce from Scripture.

- §. 12. Now the Author goeth about to prove that *Simon Magus* did give such outward appearance of real inward grace, that the Apostle thought him worthy gracious, a true and real Saint. 1. By what is said of him in the Text. 2. By the content of the Learned Interpreters. For the former, *Tu (said the Apostle) charissemus* he was baptized he conversed with Philip *et cetera*, and here is much

is much insisting upon the signification of the Original word, that it signifieth, to be alwayes present, to endure, to be assiduous; that it is attributed to hunting dogs, that will not cease following the game till they have got it; that it signifieth to persevere with strength, *Acts 6. 4. Rom. 13. 6.* and then upon all this concludes, *Tim. no doubt, was Simon very diligent and full of care and circumspection, to carry it so in all things, that he might carry it with all beholders equally to the Apostles themselves, though he might still as high in every ones opinion, even in the opinion of the Apostles themselves, as he was in the opinion of the blinded and deluded people.* And Mr. Lockier supposeth that Simons continuing with Philip, which is spoken of in the Text, was antecedent to his receiving unto the fellowship of the Church, and the ground upon consideration of which he was received. But let him then see in the Text *velam, non cessavit*; or Peters admitting him unto the fellowship of the Church, after, and upon consideration of this. Nay, it is not unworthy the observation, that Mr. Lockier in all this discourse upon *Simon Magus* doth not so much as once point his Reader to the Chapter where the story lyeth, but he hath come to making use of other Passages, which makes me apprehend, he saw that the Reader that is over so it, would easily see the weakness of his discourse by the context of the words. Saith not the Text it self, that when he was baptized *Caesars i. e.* after he was baptized and so after he was received into the Church, he continued with Philip? And so what ever may be imported by this continuing, let it be never so much evidence of inward grace, it is still *ad rem*, nothing to the purpose in hand. For we are speaking now of what was found in him before, and in relation to his reception. If Mr. Lockier had say, that he was not received into the Church fellowship, when baptized, or by baptism; I suppose first, then he must grant that there was required *instructio*, for baptizing them, then for admitting them to Visible Church fellowship. 2. Then it must follow that persons then were first baptized, and then tried a while further ere they were admitted Visible Church members. We see either practice or practice for this in all the Word of God. But Mr. Lockier says for him that he is in Scripture one baptized and not so, *pp. 101.* a member of the Visible

* *Thomas*
* *requirit*
* *est ad iudi-*
* *cium laque-*
* *non discede-*
* *re, sed assi-*
* *dum comi-*
* *sem praes-*
* *re. Con-*
* *stantin. in*
* *lex Græc.*
* *lxx.*

Visible Church. 2. That his continuing with *Philip* (whether antecedent or consequent to his admission) is but a poor ground to prove what *Mr. Lock* alledgeth it for, viz. that *Simon* had such outward appearance of real inward grace, that so far as man could judge he seemed a true and real Saint. I pray what is said? in *1 Cor. 15. 3. e.* he constantly followed and waited on *Philip*, (this is all that the word imports when joyned to a name of a person). *Mr. Lock* further crucifixe upon the word is to little purpose) and that he was astonished at the miracles and signs that were done. That which *Mr. Lock* alledgeth that no doubt *Simon Magus* was very diligent and full of care and circumspection to carry it (so in all things), &c. is no doubt a confident assertion without bottom in the Text: and yet is that evidence enough that a man is a true and real Saint as far as men can judge? I wonder how a judicious man, before judicious men, can assert such a thing. I confess this carriage of *Simon* was ground to repute him not a true hypocrite, a dissembler, and a mock professor: but it can be a ground of no further. I find indeed fondry of the Interpreters saying that *Simon* would have been equal in reputation to the Apostles themselves. But they speak not of this, as his design in his continuing with *Philip*, as the Author mistakes (for that was not a sufficiently apparent means to obtain that reputation) but his design in seeking to have the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost for his money, which was the very discovery of his rounnelles: so far was it from being any part of diligence, carefulness and circumspection, to carry it in all things &c.

- §13. For consent of the Learned Interpreters, he citeth some words of *Pist. English annot. Junius Græc. Pellicanus Bæza*. And then tells, that he addeth all these testimonies for the Learned sake that they may see and know that *Simon* he carried the name that he seemed another man when a mere professor, who like the Apostles had received him: And when this his hypocrisy did appear, the Apostles rejected him, as one got in Christ: and as one who had no share in real grace, and upon that ground rejected communion with such an hypocrite, that all else might know that such a man is no, namely, to show that none of the Apostles

Apostle, a *Tim.* 3. 9. *Having a forme of godlinesse, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away.* Which place (saith he) shewes plainly, that it was the power, and not the Professing, and not the forme that was looked, and is to be looked at, in the admission of members of the Visible Church. *Ans.* I wonder how the Author could so condemn the Learned who might read him, as to say that for their sakes he had added these testimonies cited by him, that they may see and know that *Simon* carried the matter so, that he seemed another man then a meeke Professeur, i. e. as he meant a true and real Saint? had he been pleased but to English these testimonies cited by him (that was his prudence to let them ly under the Latine veil) the very unlearned, who had common sense, would evidently have seen and known them to import no such thing. For this I appeal to the judgement of all that understand Latine, and will be pleased to read them: For I think it not worth the while to translate and insert them here: the most that any of them amounteth to, is that which the word used from the *English* author, lieth, that he made outward profession of faith and conversion: Might he not done this much, and yet not carried it so in all things, as to give ground positively to reprove him, as far as men could judge of his true and real Saint? Will Mr. Hooker acknowledge that we have had enough of another, for that end, when he saith no more of him but this, he was so convinced by miracles, as to profess faith and conversion? Nay, he'll say, is the power of Godliness, nor profession, that is to be looked at. 2. That when *Simon* hypocrisie did thus appear, the Apostle did abhorre the impiety of his deed, discover and bear in upon him the perverseness of his heart, and his miserable estate, and denounce the terrible deserved judgement of God against him, is clear in the Text. But that he did reject him from outward communion of the Visible Church, Hee'll not. Nay, what ever became of him afterward (about it Writers are of different judgement, see *Calv. in loc.*) there appears to be some grounds in the Text to think the contrary, viz. *Calv.* 1. That *Peter* with his fervent reprobation and denunciation, joyned a fervent exhortation to *Simon* to prayer, and an intimation of some hope of mercie, &c. 2. That the *Apostle* was his legitimate that

Simon did not shew himself obstinate, but accepting of the words of Peter, and touched with the terrours of the threatned Judgment, sought the help of the Apostles Prayers to escape y. 3. But supposing that Peter did at this time Excommunicate him; yet that it was done upon this account simply, that he was not in Christ, that he had no share in real grace, has no footing in the Text; we will find a further matter added to his charge, an atrocious crime seeking to buy the gift of the Holy Ghost with money. Nay, that for non-regeneration simply a man should be Excommunicat, is a wild assertion unheard of in the Word of God, which enjoyneth this censure only in the case of obstinacy and contumacious contempt of the Discipline of the Church, or at furthest in case of an atrocious scandall, which as yet is doubtful, as may appear in the debates of Learned Men about the Excommunication of the incestuous Corinthian. 4. The place, 2. Tim. 3. 5. is most contrary to the scope and purpose of the context, alledged as a rule, holding forth, that all professors not having true grace of Regeneration cannot give evidences thereof, so as as men can discern and judge, are for that to be cast out of the communion of the Visible Church. It is clear at present, that the Apostle by the men, of whom he saith, they have a form of godliness, means not every professor and hearer, or receiving evidences of living so far as men can judge of regeneration; but persons openly and grossly in their conversation scandalous, flagitious, blasphemous, &c. As is evident both by the words going before and following.

- §. 14. This last Object he laboureth to answer, the Apostle, 2. Tim. 2. 20. *But in a great house there are not only vessels of Gold and of Silver, but also of Wood and of Earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour, by how much he meant the Visible Church; therefore the Visible Church may consist of good and bad.* Mr. Lockier propounds Arguments against his Text as himself pleaseth, in the most just way for his own advantage. We hope in the next Section to give an Argument from this and other like assertions of the Visible Church touching what more dangerous than we shall only consider while he answers them, as he does by himself. His Answers are two.

First,

First, That there may be bad men in a Church hath not been denied; because Hypocrites may delude the judgement of the best men; but he (the Apostle) saith not that these vessels of earth are there allowedly; but they are there to dishonour. That is, being wrapt in where they should not be, they are to be cast out of the Church as dishonourable, as indeed were Hymeneus and Philetus, of whom and of our Alexander see what the Apostle saith, 1 Tim. 1.20. which shews, after when men put away that which they seem to have, with coupled with a good conscience; they are to be put away to their master as vessels of dishonour appointed for wrath. Answ. 1. Passing now that expression that bad men are not in the Church allowedly, having pondered before in what sense it may be granted, and in what not: passing this; what a wilde and forced interpretation is that vessels to dishonour, i. e. that are to be cast out of the Church by Ecclesiastick censure, Excommunication? Who ever dreamed of the like before? Clear it is, that the Apostle in the back or outside of the comparison by being as *honour*, means appointed and employed to more honest and honourable uses than house. And by *to dishonour*, meaneth not casting out of the house (to interpret it thus were ridiculous), but to be appointed and employed to more base and sordid uses: And in the himself or application of this simile, under the name of vessels to honour is meant the elect of God, sanctified and prepared to every good work, and ordained to glory, as is clear by the verse going before, and the verse following. And so by vessels to dishonour, are meant cast-aways whom, being in the Visible Church, God makes use of for such ends as he pleaseth, and in end will separate them to that wrath and confusion they are fitted for, whether ever here-away they break out into such scandals as shall make them to be casten out of the Visible Church, or they continue in the heap or in the house to their ending day. That this is the genuine meaning of the words, I think no intelligent man will deny. 2. It is a false supposition which Mr. Loeber insinuates, that bad men in the Church, i. e. men void of grace and unregenerate, as and these are to be cast out of the communion of the Visible Church, and are also to be cast out of the church, but because they are idolatrous and carnal men, or at least wickedly

ously scandalous (which latter yet as we said before is questionable) and it alloweth men that are such to be casten out though they be haply in state, cruelly regenerat and justified. And therefore, 3. It is a most inconsiderat word of the Author, where expressing the nature of Excommunication, he sayeth they are to be put away to their master as vessels of dishonour, and appointed unto wrath, i. e. in plain words, as reprobates ordained to eternall damnation. This is very different from *Pauls* theology, 1 Cor. 5. 5. to deliver unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, *that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus*. Far be it from me and from the Churches of Christ to use Excommunication upon such a consideration of a person and for such an end as Mr. Lockie determines here, which in effect makes the Church in the sentence of Excommunication, to determine concerning mens reprobation, a secret which God hath kept up to himself, and is altogether hid unto, and undiscernable by men except in the case of sinning against the Holy Ghost, which yet is hard for any to determine upon. 4. The Excommunication and casting out of *Hymeneus*, *Philetus* and *Alexander*, is impudently alledged to the purpose, viz. that all men that are not true Saints, or have not true grace (tho' Mr. Lockie's bad men be understood) are upon this account to be cast out of the Church; these were not such men simply, but taught abominable heresies, deny all of the Resurrection, pervert teachers of people from the faith, blasphemers, and for these they were cast out.

1 Tim. 2. 18
2 Tim. 1. ult.

S. 16. His new Answer is this: *Mistaken by this great house he (Mr. Lockie) First, means the Church of the Ephesians, for whose sake Paul wrote to Timothy, and what they were according to the judgement of the Apostle who wrote to them ye have heard*. Answer. We take what the Author saith, that this great house is the Church of the Ephesians, and it may well be so taken, as applicable to the Church of Ephesus, or any other Church; then I say he hath furnished a weapon against himself, for if this house be the Church of the Ephesians to which the Apostle wrote, then when he writing to them he called them Saints, he meant not that all and every one of them, but spake it of the body in general and confusedly, why? Should that be understood universally, it should be

But contradiction to what he saith here, that the Church of the Ephesians is a great house, in which there are some vessels to dishonour, non-saints, yea very reprobates, appointed to wrath. It will not save the matter to say, as Mr. Lockier insinuateth, that the Apostle in writing to the Ephesians, speaketh of what they were, in his judgement: For Paul is speaking his judgement here, too: Now how can these two judgements consist in one man. To my judgement, all and every one of the Church of Ephesus are real Saints, called as his, and yet I pronounce there are in the Church of Ephesus some small un-saints, very reprobates. Indeed if the Apostle here had not determined positively and purely. But by way of fulgence and exhortation, in this house, the Church of Ephesus, may be, or possibly there are some vessels of dishonour, there would not be such repugnance or incompatibility of this with the former. But he speaks absolutely and positively, there are some vessels to dishonour.

SECTION IX.

*Some further Arguments confirming our Doctrine and
overturning the adverse opinion about the necessarie qua-
lification of members of the Visible Church.*

MR. Lockier hath chosen out some Objections against his Doctrine as made by his adversaries, but indeed framed at his own pleasure, only two of them are *in causa*, the other are but extrinsecall to the cause, Reflections and prejudices against persons; this I confesse has been wisely done, for gaining advantage in the minds of Hearers and Readers unacquainted with the controversie for his own, and against his adversaries cause: But it is not very ingenuous dealing. What has there never a reason more been brought, against that Tenet of his, by learned men, but these two? I cannot think, but he has seen and read *Gul. Apolen.* consideration of certain controversies &c. sent to the Assembly at Westminster, *Spanhem's* Epistle to Mr. *Buchanan*, Mr. *Rutherford's* his first and second book against the Independent way; however he might have read them, and found therein, besides other

other writings of Orthodox Divines, some other arguments to answer; Well, because he has thought it fit to content himself with these two (which yet, how he has satisfied, we leave it to the intelligent Reader to judge) we shall add some few more, not troubling our selves nor the Reader with repetition of all that hath been said by others.

§. 2. Arg. 1. If *Moses* did admit a Member into the external communion of the Visible Church, under the Old Test. mon. calling the true God of Israel, the same way with him, and his like worship, without enquire for the inward state of the heart, or positive evidences, that he was truly converted, regenerate, and gracious, so far as we could discern and judge: Yet know, assuredly that many of them were as yet, unconverted and hard hearted: *Ierm. 9.* Upon the Baptist, the Apostles, and the Master Builder and Lord of the Church, Iesus Christ himself, did admit into the external communion of the Visible Church of the New Test. such as did profess the Christian Faith, as soon as they did profess, without delay for trying and touching evidences of the Work of Grace in their hearts. These in Churches persons ought to be admitted upon the same manner: And it is not a necessary qualification, *in foro Ecclesiastico*, for constituting one capable of Visible Church-Membership, that he be truly converted, such as God who knoweth the hearts of all men can bear witness to: as indeed sealed for his, by the Spirit, so far as men truly converted and very spiritual, are able to discern and judge; but the antecedent is true in all the parts thereof: *Arg. 2.*

§. 3. As to the consequence in connexion of the proposition, it is likely Mr. Lockier will not acknowledge it upon the last part of the antecedent, viz. the manner and way of admitting Members into the Visible Church of the Old Test. time, because his judgement, as I remember, is that the constitution of the Visible Church of the New Test. in this point is essentially different from that of the Old, for he restricts his Thesis concerning the matter of the Visible Church to the days of the Gospel; not only, which to me smelleth out of Anabaptists, who, as we know, receive Infant Baptisme upon the ground of the same, viz. of the evidences of Faith: Being pressed with this Argument taken from the

[illegible]

5-7-

To the effect of John Baptists, and the Apostles, in the pra-
 sice of John Christ himself. 'Tis worthy of observation (saith
 Mr. Baxter well against *Tombs*, pag. 127.) that 'twas said, John
 3:26. he baptizeth; 4:12. by the Ministry of his Disciples; and
 3:22. he baptizeth; 4:12. by the Ministry of his Disciples; and
 whereby it is evident that he baptizeth men
 presently and without delay, as soon as they came and presented
 themselves to him. Shall we then, miserable men, not con-
 sider this as a good example, and be more severe and
 exact in our own practice? I cannot look upon this
 too plain a passage, but as a proof of mans pride, shutting it
 tell in water a shade of power, and authority in the matters of
 God.

What further may be objected against this Argument, built upon
 that ground, whereon, *John Baptist* admitted persons to baptism? I know not,
 unless some haply will say, that baptism doth not constitute one a
 member of the Visible Church (as Reverend *Haller* conceiveth as
 large dispute, *Caro. p. 104. pag. 55. & seq.*) and that to be ad-
 mitted to baptism, and to be admitted a member of the Visible
 Church are not one and the same thing, and that more may be re-
 quired as a necessary qualification to this, than to that.
 But as to this exception. It yeeld that baptism in it self gives
 not the being of a member of the Visible Church: But that one
 must be first a member thereof *de jure* (which we say is given by
 such external profession as we have seen before, to men of
 years, and to Infants by federal holiness derived from their Pa-
 rents) otherwise baptism could not constitute one a member: Ne-
 verthelesse we hold that for certain, that baptism is the ordinary
 Ordinance whereby *salvific admittance* and initiation into actual
 communion of the Visible Church, is performed. Neither was the
 time that baptism was instituted such that he should in Scripture,
 either precept, or example of any external way or means of ad-
 mitting members of a Visible Church, beside baptism, further let
 me one of the adversaries, that they could produce from the ho-
 ly Scriptures any instance of any man being admitted to bap-
 tism, without being already a member of the Visible Church. They cannot: it is a thing manifest of in the Word
 of

of God. Therefore it is clearely evident, that upon what condition men were admitted to the Laver of baptism, that sinne was counted quittance sufficient *in foro Ecclesiastico* to constitute a member of the Visible Church, and how grosse an error in theologie were it to say that a man, tho orderly baptized, and no new impediment intervening, yet were not a member of the Visible Church: For hence it should follow that a baptized Christian, even after he is such were yet *in foro Ecclesiastico* amongst them that are without, Pagans, and idolaters. For since the Apostle divides the whole latitude of mankind into three sorts, namely, of those that are *without*, and those that are *within*, and why these that are *within* he understands such as are of the Visible Church, whom also he calls *Brethren*, &c. so by those who are *without*, he understands *idolaters*, whom he calls *the men of the world*, &c. This much for our first Argument.

S: 14

Arg. 2. If our Lord Jesus Christ has not given to any one or society of men upon earth, judiciary power, authoritatively, judicially, and positively to pronounce sentence touching the inward spiritual condition of all men professing the Christian Religion, and submitting themselves to the Ordinance of Church; whether they be regenerate or not: Then it cannot be by Christianization, a necessary qualification requisite to the admitting of persons into the outward fellowship of the Visible Church, that they be *in foro Ecclesiastico* judged truly converted and regenerated. But the former is true; therefore so is the latter. The connexion of the proposition is evident of itself. As to the assumption, let it be noted, 1. That I deny not but a Minister has power from God with Ministeriall Authority, to determine, *Doctrinally* and *in rebus*, men regenerated and in the state of grace and reconciliation, or unregenerate and as yet in the state of nature, according as they want or have the characters of true regeneration and faith. They have a warrant from the word of God to pronounce all men that have never been humbled before God, for their sins, that esteem not Christ more precious than all things beside in the World, that walk not after the Spirit but after the flesh, &c. to be unregenerate, and to separate them from the love of God, &c. To grant that Ministers have power and authority to apply the gene-
ral

all the small flock of persons, but *con-*
sidering whom all they may and ought to be able to pteſſe to
make ſeſſive application in their own conference, and as they per-
ceive the probable appearances of the one or the other ſort of
character, accordingly to pteſſe upon perſons the one more than
the other. Nor deny I but it belongs to the duty of a Mini-
ſter ſeriuſly and attentively to obſerve with wiſdome, ſo far as he
can, the way of ſuch ſoules under his charge, to diſcern and un-
derſtand, in far as may be, their ſmall condition and eſtate,
and that he may have a probable judgement of diſcretion conceiv-
ing the time, this is neceſſary to be uſeful for him, that he
may the better know how to performe that duty of dividing the
Word of God right. The effect it is to ſmall part of a Miniſters
duty to ſtudy the condition of his flock, yea, this in ſome way is
neceſſary to every particular Chriſtian in relation to others with
whom they converse, that they may be able the more accom-
plish and profitably to exhort and provoke one another to good
works. But this I ſay, that God has given to any man, or ſo-
ciety of men, power and authority judicially to cognosce upon the
ſpiritual health of every profeſſor of the Goſpel, and poſitively
to pronounce every condition of the Goſpel, upon ſuch cog-
nition, to be held a regenerate man and in the ſtate of grace, or to be
held unregenerate and yet in the ſtate of nature: Which yet Mr.
Lockier muſt needs force ſay by conſequence of his Doctrines
touching the qualification of Church members. But
now let him or any man ſhew me from the Word of God, any au-
thentick Divine power, or commiſſion of this power, given to any
man or ſociety of men in the world. The Lord has indeed given to
the Church or rather to the Officers of the Church, a power au-
thoritatively to cognosce upon all profeſſours outward ſoules and
to determine judicially whether ſinfull and ſinners, or not; but
to cognosce, determine and judge judicially and poſitively upon
their inward ſpiritual health, he hath not any where that he hath
given power to men, this he hath reserved as a prerogative to him-
ſelf to be exerciſed neceſſarily at laſt, in the day of judgement, before
all men and Angels and Saints, ſeſſed by his Word and
Spirit in the ſeats of judgement, when it ſhall come to himſelf.

self. And the same very ground the Apostle Paul hath in
in diswading them to judge one another. Which certainly must be
understood of those Spiritual states, and not that others. Be-
cause those without question may be lawfully and lawfully be
judged, (see 3. 10, 11, 12, 13) of that ship.

§ 15. ¶ Item 3. Which will also serve to confirm the preceding. If it
had been our Lords will and intention that true hearts should
conversion and faith, to let a man be deemed, should be the ne-
cessary qualification to make him a member of the Church, and
Membership, and consequently to let him be a member of the
say, to constitute and rule the Church, and to let them con-
cerning the inward work of the Spirit, whether they be
truly regenerate or not, that upon the judgment they might
be admitted unto, or debarred from the fellowship of the
Church. Then, first, he would give us a rule of trial
for regulating the Churches cognition, judgment and determina-
tion in this matter, expressing the particular characters and evi-
dences which being found in persons they might be positively judg-
ed regenerate and converted. Yet, and the Apostle Paul saith,
that the Jews were agreed to receive such characters, tell them
what, if Professors should be found to have, they are to be ac-
counted non-regenerate, or at least not to be counted Regenerate.
But there is no such rule in the Word of God, therefore &c. The
connexion of the proposition is certain and evident, and as I con-
ceive cannot be denied by any man. For first, it cannot be con-
ceived how it can consist with the Will of God, that he would
have ordained that only persons so and so qualified should be ad-
mitted to the fellowship of the Church, and all others debarred. And
that the Church should have power to cognose, And positively to
judge every professor, that they are so qualified or not, in rela-
tion to admitting or excluding them. And yet not have prescribed
a definite rule for regulating the Churches cognition and judgement
of this. But let it without question be the duty of the Church, both
judge and rule, to determine whether the persons be regenerate or not,
certainly the Church cannot consist with itself, to be divided, when one
shall be a member, and another not, and yet not have a rule to
assist and direct, and therefore, I think, it is not possible for the
Church to be divided, and yet not have a rule to assist and direct.

ther, so that oftentimes there should be *ut dicitur quod capita*. The very same will readily vary from Church at diverse times: Yet the best of men are subject to sinful affections which may and will be doubt oftentimes by all the judgements, and having no small influence thereupon: And so what confusions, disorders, vexations and oftentimes grievous injuries to persons in the matter of admission into or exclusion from the fellowship of the Church might not this open a door to, if the matter were committed wholly to man's judgement without any other rule? Therefore it must be confessed, that there must be a rule for regulating the Churches cognition and judgement in this matter, which the opposers will not deny. 2. This rule must be such as to both bind not only the particular churches upon the having or wanting of which the Church must consist, and accordingly as it found to judge men Regenerate or not: But also the very *minimum quod sit*, the lowest degree and measure whereupon the judgement of the Church is to proceed: My meaning, to speak as plainly as I can to the weaker sort is this: the rule must declare how much is sufficient and necessary at least, to produce a just judgement that a man is Regenerate, of which if a man come short, we have any wayes less, he is to be reputed non-Regenerate, at least not to be reputed Regenerate, which according to Mr. Leake's Doctrine debars him from being received as a Member of the Church. The reason of this is clear: because otherwise the matter should be left in a meer uncertaintie, and in effect devolved upon the meer arbitrement of the Churches judgement: If to wit, the rule should say no more but *indefinitely*, a man, that he may be positively judged a true Regenerate Convert, must have some knowledge of the Articles of Religion, experience of effectual calling unto Faith and Repentance, and conformity of conversation to the Gospel: Not determining definitely this or thus much at least, he must have, which if he have, he is to be judged and reported truly Regenerated, and if he come short of any such, not.

Now for the assumption, let it be noted full, we deny not but God hath his down in his Word's Rule, desires and certain Characters and Signs, which every Christian, having knowledge thereof, and willing conscience to try and weigh his heart and

ways, and to compare the same with the rule, may passe a positive, yea certain and infallible sentence and judgement upon himself, whether he be Regenerate and in the state of Grace, or not: This we asseert against Papists maintaining that he never nor have, nor, by ordinary means, can have assurance of their being in the state of grace: and against the wilde Antinomian of this time maintaining that this cannot be had by inferiour works and signes of Grace. 2. We deny not but there are some more eminent outward works and actions of Religion and Piety, upon which men in whom they are seen, may be warrantably by others, so far as is competent to men, positively judged truly gracious: and that there are some outward works and actions of the flesh designed by the Word of God to grosse and corrupt, such as are constant known neglect of the Worship of God, open contempt of Divine Ordinances, custumarie mocking of Piety and Religion, and men others, (see 1 Tim. 3. 2, 3, 4.) which appearing in men, others may easily be them void of Grace, carnall, without the Spirit and fear of God.

These things then being put out of controversy, this is the thing we cannot see in the Word of God: a general and universall rule for trying and trying judgement upon all and every Professant in point of Regeneration and non-Regeneration, by others then themselves: and holding forth such definite limited and bounded Characters of Regeneration, whereupon others may passe a positive sentence or judgement, viz. this man is to be held truly Regenerate, because he hath so much, or so much Profession and practise: and this man is to be held not Regenerate, at least, not to be held Regenerate, because he hath not so much. I say we cannot see any rule of this kind, held forth in the Word of God: let Mr. Lockier if he hath seen it, point us at it. Verily if he had had a mind to satisfie his readers and hearers, or done that which was requisite to have been done by him, in reason to satisfie and convince them of the doctrine he delivered touching the matter of Members of the Visible Church, viz. *that all and every one of them must be truly converted and freed of sin, for his, so far as men very far small can judge, he should have told them and that from the Word of God, a few particular definite bounded Characters, whereby all and every man should be able to see and are to be by others then themselves discerned*

discerned and judged to be such or otherwise, but having never so much as once in his lecture assayed to determine this we must crave leave to say he has left them & his Doctring both in the mist. However he has done it yet, and we shall passe that escape. Others of his way or towards it, have assayed it: but when that which they have said to this purpose is duly examined and pondered, I believe it shall be found by judicious and impartiall men much unsatisfactory, and still leaving the matter in the dark. Let's take into consideration what some of the more judicious of them have determined in this matter.

Mr. Hooker *Serv. p. 1. c. 1. pag. 1.* layeth down the rule of 6 17. ground in these words, *he that professing the faith, lives not in the neglect of any known duty, nor in the commission of any known evil, and hath such a measure of knowledge, as may be reason for let in Christ into the soul, and carry the soul to him, shall be ground, by which charity passed according to rule, may and ought to conceive, There be some beginnings of spiritual good.* Here are two things laid down to make up the ground to proceed upon. 1. Living without omission of any known duty, or in commission of any known evil. 2. So much knowledge as may let in Christ to the soul, and lead the soul to him. And commonly amongst them there is yet a further thing required to ground this judgement, *viz.* a declaration of the experimentall work of faith and Conversion in the heart. Mr. Norton *pag. 12.* and Mr. Hooker himself, *p. 3. c. 1. pag. 1.* (the person to be admitted) *must be tryed, not only what he knoweth, but what his acquaintance is with the things of Christ and his Kingdome.* Experience and acquaintance with Christ importeth more then knowledge that may let Christ into the soul, and carry the soul to Christ: Even knowledge that he is in, *scilicet.* Now let us examine these things so far as concerneth our present purpose.

Remember then what we are upon, whether the Lord in his 5: 18. Word has set down a general and impartiall rule for universall tryall of professors upon the point of their regeneration or birth regeneration, holding forth such determinat grounds, as the Church must take cognition of, and upon the having thereof, may lawfully positively judge persons to be truly regenerate and converted ones.

this

this promised. 1. This rule is so broad that, as to this part of the ground, *knowledge*; Mr. *Hooker* gives us nothing but an indefinite generall, *so much knowledge as may let in Christ into the souls*; but tells not, defines not, the bounds of knowledge, that we might know how much knowledge, will serve for this purpose, nor can we then which, will not do it. So the rule as to this part set down by Mr. *Hooker* is but a blind. And really I think it shall be hard for any man to define particularly, how much knowledge is requisite to let in Christ and let forth which will not do it. Mr. *Norton* speaking of this part of the *synopsis*, upon which the judgement of the Church is to proceed, pag. 12, in fin. and 13. *synopsis*, he defines the knowledge required, to be the *fundamentals*, *calls*, and other heads of Religion; the knowledge whereof is necessary for leading a life without scandal. But beside, that it hath never been clearly yet shown by any what are the precise fundamentals of Religion, (and I suppose hardly can be) it were a hard allegation to affirm that the knowledge of all these heads of Religion that are necessary to lead a life without scandal, is necessary to cause regeneration, and to the declaration thereof necessary to ground the Churchs judging of him to be such, for admitting him to Church fellowship. I think a man may be ignorant all the time of his life of the strict morality of the Lords day (the knowledge whereof yet, it being supposed to be of divine institution (as it is) is necessary to lead a life without scandal) and yet be truly regenerat, and such as the Church may judge in charity truly gracious.

2. When it is said they must be such as live not (which he expresseth, to know, having in, but to tread in it) in the neglect of any evil, or in the commission of any known evil. 1. The Church being it not upon a ground of proceeding and judging, which is morally impossible, for them to have any certain cognition of by ordinary observation, because men may live in a known sin of commission, committing such as will not be of (as Mr. *Hooker* himself testifies) to be known and punished by the power of the word and outward discipline, which is law; and will not cause the commission of any more and further evil. Mr. *Norton* hath observed, that supposing that a man be a *hypocrite* in his heart, *scandal*,

scandall, that is, offence before men. And Mr. Hooker himself a little after he hath laid down the rule, wavering from himself (as indeed in handling this Question, about the necessary qualification of Church members, he is exceeding uncertain in expressing his mind) he speaks not of *living in any known sin*, but of *committing some grosse evil*. But then, 2. Is freedom from living in grosse evils, or outward scandalls, ground sufficient, with a profession of the truth, for the Church to passe a positive sentence or judgement that a man is regenerate and really in Christ? I think indeed it may be a ground, to keep us from positive judging the contrary of them, which in effect is nothing else, but to abstract from positive judging of their inward spirituall condition at all. 3. If not living in the neglect of any known duty, *i. e.* living in the performance of all known duty (or if he will, all known duties obvious to the notice of men) and not living in the commission of any known evil, *i. e.* living in abstinence from any known evil (or if he will, obvious to the notice of men) must be the ground whereupon to proceed upon this judgement to be passed upon a mans regeneration in relation to his admission to the Visible Church, and this *living* importeth a trade (as Mr. Hooker exponeth) that is, a continued course: Then I would enquire how long time living so is sufficient to ground the Ecclesiastick judgement, and lesse then which will not serve the turn? This was necessary to have been determined that the rule might be certain, *i. e.* definite and constant, that the mater might not be devolved upon the arbitrement of mans judgement, or rather pleasure: Here is *alcum flentium*, and so again the mater left in the mist. To presse this the more and the more clearly, I put the case the person desiring to be admitted to the fellowship of the Church, and so to be judged of the Church, whether Regenerate or not, is one who has been an heathen, living before and till that very time in some known sins (as many sins are to heathen known sins) of omission and commission. Now I inquire how long time must be taken to evidence him, not to be a liver in these known sins, to the effect that a positive judgement may passe upon him that he is Regenerate? Let a positive answer be given to this. If any shall say, a definite time is not necessary for trying such an one, if he have Repentance for these sins, and

as soon as he hath it, it is enough according to what Mr. Norton speaketh (*conversatio absque scandalo, penitential non sanaro.*) when I say, Repentance here must be understood either as comprehending the inward grace in the heart, but this falls not directly and immediately under the cognition of the outward Court, to be a ground or medium of their procedour into judgement, yea it is the very thing, or a part of the thing, which is so to be concluded in the judgement: Or it must be taken as only comprehending the outward part of it, i. e. Reformation which is nothing else but performing of the duties formerly neglected, and abstaining from the evils formerly committed, and if so, then we are just where we were, in the mist yet.

5. 10. 3. As for the third ground or part of the rule, a declaration of the experimentall work of Conversion or acquaintance with Christ, as Mr. Hooker expresseth it, or (is distinctly the Author of the narration of the practices of the Churches of New-England, pag. 9.) of their effectuell vocation, in their sound Repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, it most unwarrantable and rigid. What? must this be a generall rule for all professors, that they must make a declaration of this experimentall work upon their heart, that they may be judged Repentant and Converts, and so capable of admission to the Visible Church? What warrant for this in the Word? The places pointed at by that last Author, *Mat. 3. 8. Luke 3. 8. Acts 8. 37.* does not warrant any such thing. In the former two *John Baptist* indeed charged these people to perform really the work of Reformation and Repentance, that they might not delude themselves with vain imaginations of interest in God upon common privileges: But required not of them a declaration of the experimentall work thereof upon their hearts, that thereupon a positive judgement might be passed concerning the truth of the work in their hearts. So in the place, *Acts 8. 37. Philip* telleth the *Eunuch*, what is his duty in relation to the subscription of Baptism, that he believe with all his heart. And together, I conceive, importeth the requiring of a profession of so much, that he might Admitt to Baptism to him. But neither does *Philip* require, nor the *Eunuch* make a declaration of the experimentall work in his heart, in relation to passing a positive

positive judgement concerning the inexistence of the work in his heart. Verily, were this made an universall rule or ground whereby to judge of professors Conversion, and consequently of their admission unto Church fellowship; many an honest, gracious soul should never obtain such a judgement upon them while they live; there being many such, who, put them to declarations of this kind, could say little or nothing. He that were best read in practicall tractats of the nature of Repentance and Faith, and the way of the Spirits working of these, and had a gift of utterance, should carry the fairest sentence, what ever were the reall work in his heart; if he could but carry fair outwardly in his conversation, as in hypocrite may, without scandall. Nay, it were in effect to erect a stage for hypocrites to out themselves upon, and to cast a stumbling block in the way of honest hearts, not indued with the gift of expressing themselves. I deny not but good use may be made of drawing out of Christians, what experience they find of the work of the spirit upon their hearts, and conferences between Ministers and People, and between Christians among themselves, may and ought prudently to be exercised for that end; But I speak against the making of declarations of this sort, a generall rule and ground for iudiciall tryall and passing judgement concerning the Regeneration and Conversion of Professours.

To conclude this Argument, when these particulars held forth §. 11. by the Word of God are considered and laid together. 1. That Regeneration and Conversion being an inward work in the heart, no judgement can be made thereupon by man, but by outward actions. 2. That it is not the outward actions according to their mater, *or the deed done*, but as they are done from such principles, faith, and love, and for such an end, the glorifying and pleasing of God, that argues the heart to be Regenerat, and the doer to be in Christ and in the state of grace, and consequently, that a man cannot positively judge of anothers Regeneration by them, but as they appear, someway, to be done out of such Principles, and for such an end. 3. That actions good upon the mater, may in some probability, at least, appear to others, to be done from such principles and to such an end, tis not enough to have the mans own word and assertion for it; but there must be, a good name of them,

and that under some varieties of cases and conditions, and some tentations. For to act right for a short, or to act right even for a good time, a man coming under no alteration of condition or being under small or no tentations, does not give much appearance to men without; that these actions are right in their principles and ends. 'Tis evenness and constancy in alterations of cases, and under tentations assailing to turn off the way, that carrieth appearance of discovery of this. 4. That the greatest part even of true Converts are not eminent Saints, but weaklings and but as Children, and that unregenerate civilians and hypocrites may in outwards go far beyond many sound gracious Christians. 5. Yea that many true Converts may be under the prevalency of some sinfull infirmities and affections, so far, as not only to have, but for a long time, may be even to their last dayes, as to live (though not with inward liking and allowing (which is not seen by others) yet to the outward committing) in known sinfull actions. As for example, may not gracious Christians be thus subject to an outward course of known cankerdness or some other the like distemper? Let these things be considered and laid together, and tell me if there can be a general rule whereby there may and should be a judicial tryall and positive judgement passed upon all and every Professour desiring the fellowship of the Church, concerning their Regeneration or non-regeneration? Wherefore I cannot but commend both the judicious and moderate determination of Mr. Norton, who when he has laid down the rule or grounds of the *next* *year*, whereby judgement is to be passed upon persons about their spirituall estate, in relation to admitting them to Church-fellowship (wherein yet I cannot joyn with him as being too strait and rigid) and coming to define what sort of judgement it is, that is to be passed upon them, he saith we must not judge positively, but negatively and practically, *i. e.* (saith he) not judge *what* *of* *them*. 2. To carry our selves towards them as *criminals* *as* *if* *they* *were* *good*, where 'tis clear, that as to the act of judgement, he requirith no more, but that we judge not men *unregenerate*, and this is nothing else upon the matter but that *case* which was determined *concerning* the Question, *viz.* that in admitting or receiving into the fellowship of the Visible Church, we are to *test* *it* *and* *take*

take for sufficient qualifications such or such outward professions, prescinding or abstracting (*simplici abstractione*) from the inward spirituall estate of the man; for when I do not positively judge a man Regenerat or really gracious, but only judges not him unregenerat and gracelesse, certainly I abstract from both.

I will not here slip by what I apprehend my self, and while I am §. 11. Writing this, I finde Mr. Baxter in his Book against *Tombs* hath distinctly (for untill this time I had much longed for it, yet I had not the occasion to see that Peece) which may be replied, to that I have been saying in the prosecution of this Argument, tho it cometh not up to that Mr. Lockier and others of his way would be at. This Reverend Author, I find, sayeth these things. 1. That none is to be admitted into the fellowship of the Visible Church, but such as may and are judged, to be members of the Invisible Church and true beleivers. P. 1. c. 27. pag. 73. I take it for granted (saith he) that to be a visible member of the Church, and so be a member of the Visible Church is all one. And a little after, Because men seem to be of the Invisible Church therefore they truly are of the visible, and then, if we were fully assured by his own externall discoveries, that any man were not of the Invisible Church, that man should not be taken to be of the Visible. And a little after, therefore if a converted Jew were to be taken in to the Church upon his profession, we ought not so admit him, except his profession seem to be serious, and so sincere. 2. That the judgement to be passed upon a man that he may be received into the Visible Church, is not pure that he is a true beleiver, but *modò* that 'tis probable that he is a true beleiver, pag. 93. 3. That the rule of this judgement he saith is this, a serious professor of the faith, is to be taken by us for a true beleiver, he meaneth as before, probably. I do much reverence and honour in my estimation, this judicious acute and Godly man, and accounts the Church of God much obliged to him under God, especially for his learned and profitable pains in vindicating the right of Infant-Baptism. Yet I do confesse, in sundry things I cannot be of his judgement, which I know by his frequent and serious expressions to this purpose, he will not take ill; had it not been for directions otherwise and particularly, by this unreasonable peece, and I may say,

say, both uncharitable to this Church and unsatisfactory to any judicious man; I would made bold ere now modestly to have represented to himself considerations upon some things I have found in his other Peece; and may be if God grant us both continuance of life, and me some leisure I shall do that yet, and adde some things also out of this Peece last comt to my hands.

6. 23.

* Oh that our Brethren that are so inclineable to separation because of the unsoundness of our Church members and un- Church whole Parishes (Mr. Lockier doth whole Nations) and gather Churches out of them, as if they were no Churches, and they must be such as are the work of

But now to the present purpose. 1. The learned Author and I are fully agreed upon the matter concerning the outward ground upon which persons are to be admitted and acknowledged members of the Visible Church, viz. a serious profession of the faith, including a profession of obedience to the commands and ordinances of Christ, is sufficient for this; and that persons making this profession, are without delay or searching for trial and discovery of the work of their heart-conversion, to be admitted. The Passages he citeth for this purpose, *P. 2. c. 8 pag. 126, 127.* see clear for it. I do heartily approve his weighty exhortation subjoined thereunto, to these of the Independent way, and presents the same to Mr. Lockier to be laid to heart by him, and the Lords fight. See the *Margine* *. But I cannot yet agree with him in this, that men are not to be received into the Visible Church but under the notion of true believers, and positively judged to be such, though but probably. 1. I can see no warrant in the Word for this. 2. The grounds that the learned Author himself for it, *pag. 73.* do not seem convincing. 3. Whereas he saith that it is all one to be a visible member of the Church and a member of the Visible Church. And he that denyeth this will manifest his vanity. I say if the name *Church* be taken in one and the same notion in both Propositions, I confesse 'tis true he saith: and he would show his vanitie that would deny it: but in the former where *Church* be taken for that society which is Christs mystical redeemed body, the Epistle *Isaiah* noting is, not the nature of membership, but an adjunct of it: I deny it evidently of these two Propositions: and cannot see but it is foule enough to deny it. Again when he saith that the

work of heart-conversion be they admit them, would but lay to heart of the former examples, and make more conscience of exceeding their role and not presume to be wiser and better then God. He that goes beyond Jesus Christ shall go without him. *Gal. 3. and 3. 10* I wish him

Invisible

Invisible is properly and primarily called the Church, and the Church Visible containing all the ungodly part, is called the Church secondarily and for the sake of the Invisible; I acknowledge this is ordinarily said, but can see no reason for it. I find three special Ecclesiastick significations of this name *ecclesia* in Scripture, viz. 1. The society or company of redeemed ones, effectually called from the estate of nature. 2. A society outwardly called into and making profession of the faith, worship and service of God in Christ. 3. An Assembly of Officers employed in government of Professors. However I confesse the first signification is principall and most excellent is to the thing - yet I think all of them are alike proper and none of these things has the name by way of reference to another of them. 3. When he saith, *That if we were fully certain by his own external discoveries, that a man were not of the Invisible Church, that man should not be taken to be of the Visible; and if any Jew or Pagan were to be taken into the Church upon his profession, we ought not to admit him, except his Profession seem to be serious and sincere.* For this I represent three considerations. 1. If we were fully certain by his own external discoveries, that a man were not of the Invisible Church, neither actually, nor potentially, or in the purpose of God, i.e. if we were fully certain by his own external discoveries, that he were a reprobate (as these that sin against the Holy Ghost, and these only, discovers themselves to be such) true he were not to be received into the Visible Church; even because he were known to be, this way not of the Invisible Church. 2. I confesse also that were a mans outward carriage and way such, as did discover him positively not to be of the Invisible Church actually, i.e. as did discover him positively, to be an unregenerate man (though I did not discover him to be as a reprobate, i.e. not so much as potentially of the Invisible Church) he were not to be received into the fellowship of the Visible. But withall I say he were to be debarred or not received, not upon the account of non-regeneration, nor upon that carriage considered under this formality and reduplication, as a signe and discovery of non-regeneration; but *materially*, as being contrary to the very outward profession of the faith, for such a carriage only I conceive it would be this; my reason why I deny that non-regeneration or

any

any thing considered formally under the notion or reduplication, as a signe of non-regeneration (which is all one) should be the cause for excluding a man from admission into the Visible Church, is because I conceive it is Gods revealed will in his word that men be received into the Visible Church that they may be Regenerat and converted and that the Ministeriall dispensation of the Ordinances, are by Gods revealed will set up in the Church to be means of Regeneration and Conversion, as well as edification of such as are Regenerat. 3. I conceive between such as are in a course and carriage, which indeed discovers evidently and certainly non-regeneration (e. g. as to be without the profession of Christianity, to live in some heresie directly contrary to the foundation, as is Socinianism, to live in a constant course of known prophanity) and such as are seemingly Regenerat and so to be *positively* judged such in probability; there may be, yea and are many of a midde sort who are in such an estate and condition ourward, and as relating to mans judgement of them that as they do not, unto full certainty of judgement, discover themselves non-regenerat. so there is not sufficient ground positively to judge them probably Regenerat, and so to use them, that is to dispence Ordinances to them as such and in a way suteable to men supposed to be Regenerat: But the most we can in our judgement of their state is to preſcind from passing a positive judgement either way; as for example, a man when he comes first to make a serious, sober profession of the faith, before we have further experience of his way, or of whom we know no more as yet, but that he seriously professeth the truth; and offereth subjection to Ordinances, I confesse this is a ground sufficient, probably to judge the man is elect, God has a purpose to save him, and could we not judge this much probable of him, I will not say we should receive him in that case. But it is not sufficient this alone and by it self, to ground a positive judgement that he is Regenerat or actually in the state of grace, though you call it a judgement of probability: my reason is this, because to ground a positive act of judgement, that a man is Regenerat *in foro exteriori*, there is requisite some seemingnesse (to speak so) of spirituall sincerity in a mans profession, i. e. that he doth it from a spirituall principle, upon spirituall motives, and for a spirituall end: But a meer

mean sober, not making, serious profession without more is not a positive appearance of spiritual or supernatural sincerity; at least therefore I humbly conceive it is a mistake to confound seriousness and sincerity in the context of spiritual or supernatural sincerity (as he must understand it here) for that is larger then this: many are serious in their profession, who are not sincere in this sense: yea may evidence themselves when they do not as yet give any positive evidence of sincerity. And therefore I conceive, he doth not rest on good enough ground, when it will be said, p. 136 for that Mr. Baxter requiring a profession sober, serious, and sincere, he doth discharge us enquire after the sincerity of their profession. If Mr. Baxter meant spiritual and natural sincerity, as I conceive he doth, the distinction of moral sincerity, and spiritual or supernatural sincerity is common amongst practical Divines, and naturally; and there may be positive probable evidences of the former, when there is not yet so much of the latter. I humbly conceive, there cannot be had positive, probable evidences of this, ordinarily, without observation of a mans way after profession for a time, wherein notice may be taken of his walking usually in the latitude of duties, and constantly in variety of cases and conditions. But the other may sooner and more easily appear and positively be judged of, as we judge of a mans seriousness in any other action. And 'tis Mr. Baxters own judgement, that as soon as a man maketh profession of the faith, without delay or tryall for discovery of his heart-Conversion, he is to be admitted into the Visible Church. To conclude, Mr. Baxter and I are in agreement upon the matter concerning the qualification that is sufficient for admitting persons into the Visible Church, viz. sober serious profession, without delay to enquire for more, and so we are agreed in the issue about the matter of the Visible Church: We differ in this that he thinks persons are not to be admitted, but under the consideration of persons judged, at least probably, Converted and Regenerated. My mind is that they are to be admitted under the name of serious, sober, outward professors, abstracting from Conversion or regeneration. Whichever of the matter, and as to the main bunnelle of the matter of the Visible Church, will only make some differences between us in some Arguments to prove the main conclusion.

conclusion. Some say, that I will not say this way, but that is not much to be said. Now I answer, that Ar-
gument.

- §. 2. If the Ministry and Ministerial dispensation of the Gospel, be
essentially the preaching of the Gospel in the Church, be instituted
and appointed by Jesus Christ in his name, not only for con-
vincing and perfecting the work of saving souls, which is already
begun: but also for converting and bringing in Christians into
the Church of Grace, such is an essential condition, necessary to re-
generate, for the Church, and for the salvation of the Church. To
qualify the Church, for the preaching of the Gospel, and for the
of the Church, by planting the Church in the Church, and
and Society of the Visible Church, that they may be truly
general. Concerning the Church, and for the Church, or
give such manner of ministers of this, as that they may be ought
to be judged by the Church, truly Regenerates and Converted.
But the former part or antecedent is true: Therefore the con-
sequent.

- §. 3. The connexion of the antecedent is clear to any dis-
cerning man. For *ex suppositione consequens sequitur appositionem
antecedentis*, i. e. if all that are in the Visible Church be supposed
to be already and antecedently to their reception into the Visible
Church, truly Converted and Regenerated. What is the Mini-
ster as a Minister, or the Ministerial dispensation of the Gospel, does
with Converting of souls. All with whom he has to do as a Mini-
ster are supposed to be Converted and Regenerated, and from his Mini-
stry he has only to do with their *conversion* to Grace. This is the
more congruent towards our notions of the Independent way,
that they make the Ministry relative to a particular Visible Church
only, and that a Minister cannot act, as a Minister, but in relation
to a particular Visible Church and these that are within it: And
therefore if a Minister by preaching the Gospel, should be an in-
strument of the Conversion and Regeneration of a soul, yet
that is but by accident, and not done by him as a Minister. If
any Ministry that many of these who are received into the Visible
Church, albeit they be supposed and intended to be true Converts
and Regenerates, yet they may really be unconverted and un-
regenerated.

agreed upon, and so may, being in the Church and under the Ministry, be converted by the Ministry, and preaching of the Gospel. That is nothing to the purpose: It is but by accident that this cometh to passe, and we know that a man were unregenerate and unconverted, he were not to be received under the Ministry. Yes, were he before a member, he should be by Mr. Lockers Tenet, re-Churched again, till he were a true Convert. And thus which cometh to passe by the Ministry of the Word, viz. by accident, cannot be said to be a duty for which it is instituted, and set up in the Church. Yes, I am bold to say, that the Visible Church consisteth of all and only such as are regenerate, and that all men can discern, so far as they are able, their admission into the Church, truly Converted, and Regenerate. It is not their duty, that the ordinary Minister of the Church, his duty is also to Preach points of Doctrine tending to preparatory humbling, awaking of nature, confessions, and Converting souls to Christ, but all his Preaching ought to be, upon points that concerne comforting, directing, strengthening, confirming, souls already Converted: he shall have nothing to do to bring souls to be reconciled to God, but he is only to help them to enjoy the sweetness and comfort of Reconciliation, they are already stated in; Farewell all Preaching of mens miserable estate by nature, of the terrors of the Law, except only it be to let souls know the better what they are delivered from.

For the solution of the Argument, viz. that the Ministry and Ministerial discipline, and Preaching of the Gospel, is instituted to be an ordinary means of Converting souls, as well as of advancing grace in them that are Converted, may be proven by innumerable Scriptures. I shall point at some, 1. Prov. 9. 1, 4. *Wisdom hath sent forth her maidens, she cryeth upon the high places of the Citie, who so is simple let him turn in hither, as for him that wanteth understanding, she sayeth to him, come eat of my bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled.* By these maidens of wisdom are meant, (as hereafter we see) the Ministers of the Word sent forth by Jesus Christ. Now what is the end and end for which they are sent? To call and invite such as are simple and have no understanding, i. e. (as Cartwright well expoundeth) such,

which are not in the Ministry of the private Christians, and
not the Ministry of the Ordination, are the ordinary means and in-
struments of converting souls. Is a nice dream having no warrant
in the Word of God. I know Mr. Hooker borrows at my Re-
verend Congregation, for charging this absurdity upon them: And he
conceives that is a dream, and hath no warrant in the Word, and
wonders how such an absurdity is so continually in the ears and
tongues of the people, and how he knoweth the contrary is
correct. But what the good man was in error, as Mr. Hooker said
without cause. For it should be observed from his principles, on
any conclusion concerning the Ministry of the private Christians, the Church
cannot be constituted, if any man shall be supposed to be before
converted; and in Visible Churches, as in ordinary Ministry,
neither can there be a Minister, nor in a private Church, (as
thought of malicious) I pray, what must be the ordinary means
(for there are not always Apostles extraordinarily sent of God)
of converting souls but private Christians? What the good man
saith, pag. 84. *how falls of new gathered Churches with us, are
such as have been converted by Ministers in their several Con-
gregations.* With reverence of his memorie be it spoken, is child-
ish and nothing to the purpose. For first, the Question is not how
or by what means, *do fall out* of what man is converted, but what
followeth upon his Time: And according to the genius of this
it followeth clearly that all are supposed to be converted (we speak
of Conversion to Christianity) before they come under a Ministry,
and so by private Christians. And these some, of whom you ga-
ther your Congregations, having them from under other Ministers;
in their several Congregations, if these Congregations be rightly
constituted, according to your principles, were converted ere ever
they came under such Ministers.

Argument 3. If the state of the Visible Church were only
real Saints and the communion of the Visible Church true holiness, S. 17
and living grace. Yet Mr. Hooker roundly exposteth in his Treatise,
pag. 19. *which by expresse opposition to* *freely given*, pag.
25. *or such as are positively to be judged such by evidence to
far as men may possibly can discern* (as other where he exposteth

* Hooker
Sur. p. 1. c. 7.
pag. 84, 85.

it) then it doth follow that excommunication is the Visible Church, or
 some congregation simply, or some congregation in some sort of visible
 evidence to ground a positive judgement of his Regenera-
 tion ought to be Excommunicated and cast out of the Visible
 Church; but the consequence is false. For that excommunication
 The communion of the populus Mr. Lockington says, has no
 effect on his own, pag. 28. where he says Excommunication is
 an Ordinance to cleanse the House of God and keep it pure, and
 according to what is ought to be so far as men can discern, accord-
 ing to his Tenet, consisting of only one Saint, and not one in
 them. And surely we should if men were in where they should
 not be, (i.e. if men were Excommunicated out of the Visible Church)
 they not be cast out of the Church, pag. 28. in the end of the pa-
 per, he saith, he is not, and I say so, but one Saint
 so he is cast out of the Church. But he should have said, by the
 consequence of his Tenet, not one, *one known person*, as he
 saith, &c. As to the Affirmation, that it is false, that for non-re-
 generation simply, or defect of positive evidences of Regeneration
 persons are to be cast out of the Visible Church. Because
 there is neither precept nor promise in the Word of God casting
 out any upon this account. For it is *not* to produce any thing
 from Scripture of this kind. The Scripture enjoyneth Excommu-
 nication for obstinate, in known publick scandalous sins in conver-
 sation, or heresie in Doctrine, or in most flagitious crimes
 (whether the persons be judged *Christians* or not) but no mention of any other cause of Excommunication. And in
 matters *de jure* in Religion, a negative Argument from Scripture,
 is true, 'tis not commanded, but no *positive* in Scripture, *Exco*
 ought not to be done. I do not know any Argument following
 upon this opinion is one of the chief Arguments amongst others, that
 of a long time has swayed me to think, that the way which is not
 of God: But on the contrary (tho I tell not the story of many of
 the followers of it and has no harsh thoughts of them in this
 therein) that 'tis a subtle device of Satan transforming himself into
 an Angel of light, set on foot by him as to advance Antichrist in the
 World, so in special to overturn the Protestant Religion and
 Churches. For if none shall be permitted to be members of the
 visible

will be deceived, but such as are such Salts, at least so far as men may be small and discern and judge upon such evidences, as they of this way holdeth forth. Their being in all sorts the far fewest number, even very few in comparison all the rest (of whom yet many may have some seeds of true living grace in them, albeit it be not communicable to others) tho they were not outwardly contumacious against the Ordinances, must be in Churched, casten out, to be as some what any Pastoral cure, for watching over their souls; either as they like, without any spiritual means, to be as some what casten them: to be a ready prey to Satan, and his instruments, as he himself hath Achille, as placed into some more heale, which never. What a far smaller burning and consuming of souls, would have been sufficient to have done that work of his, than to have done all the Reformed Churches? I would think the burning of it on foot and setting it on in this Island is an evident influence from that Antichristian Synagogue upon this way design to overturn the Protestant Churches.

Argument 6. That Doctrine which teach unavoidably to the 5 18. holding out from the Fellowship of the visible Church, and so from all the necessary means of grace and salvation influenced by Christ, are only many who may be the seed of God, and whom we cannot but probably judge to be such, but also many, who may have some measure of true Regenerating grace in them, and yet leaves a door open to any Reproach against it, of whom it pretends to be not to be such. Forasmuch as they who are dissimble well and easily, may remain in that Doctrine, I say, it seemeth, cannot be from God. But that Doctrine concerning the necessary qualification of Church-members, as usual and maintained by Mr. Hooker is such a doctrine, that the Proposition I conceive will not be denied by any who are sensible of these things. 1. That the means of grace, and the Ordinances of God, are instituted and set up in the Church, primarily and per se, for the elect sake, that they may obtain salvation. Hence is that of the Apostle, 1 Tim. 2:14. *that I desire to desire all things for the elect sake, that they may obtain that salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory.* Notwithstanding the words of this Judicious Bishop Comenius *Essay* upon the words, *in* (Grace, respect her)

flaxes, who have some measure of true grace in them; who yet not only are weak in knowledge, unable to give an account of all the fundamentalls of Religion, and such points as are necessary to lead a life without scandall (which yet are required as the ground of that judgement our adversaries will have to passe upon persons; to be admitted members of the Visible Church) but also under many sensible, sinfull infirmities, which may render them suspected to others, to be no reall Saints, may puzzle others to passe judgement on them, at least, may put them to a suspense from passing a positive judgement upon them, as true saints, sealed of God for his; by his Spirit. And all such by Mr. *Lockiers* Doctrine must be held forth from the Visible Church, and so from the benefit of all publick Ordinances, the ordinary means of Salvation. These two considerations, I professe have been to me further motives to make me think the way held forth by this Doctrine concerning the qualification, *in foro Ecclesia*, of Church members, not to be of Christ; it being so obstructive to the proper end and design of the setting up of the Ordinances and means of grace in the Church, and contrary to Christs own way of dealing with souls; and yet no cast-away or unregenerate man shall be excluded, if he but be studied in tractates of theologie, and can carie it fair before men, as indeed hypocrisie may stand with great externall formalities of Religion, in word and conversation.

There are two things I find, may haply by said by the Brethren of this way in answer to this Argument. 1. That such persons may be hearers of the Word, tho they be not admitted members of the Visible Church, *we admit say they even infidels to the hearing of the Word.* To this I think Reverend Mr. *Rutherford* has said truly, that to be admitted as ordinary hearers of the Word, and Church prayers, is a degree of admission to Church-membership; and they who are baptized, and ordinarily hear and professe a willing mind to communicat with the Church in the Holy things of God, they, being not scandalously wicked, ought to be admitted, yea are members of the Visible Church. But 2. To say that men are not members of the Visible Church and yet that they may be ordinary hearers of the Word, according to your principles is but a fair word to make Children fain of nothing. For say ye, a

Minister is a Minister only in relation to his particular flock and the members thereof, therefore say I, as a Minister he is to Preach the Word only to them, and therefore he must suit his Preaching of the Word unto them, that is, unto men sealed of God by his Spirit, so far as men very spirituall can discern, and so as a Minister or a Ministeriall Preacher of the Word, he is not obliged to bring any word for hearing, for the case of that man that is not a member, and so if that man hear ordinarily or at all (tho he come to hear) any Preaching of the Word fitted or prepared to do him good, 'tis more through hap then good guiding, as we say; or else you must say, that a Minister when he is to Preach the Word, he must prepare and study something as a Minister, for Visible Church-members, futeable to such; and something to Preach as a privat gifted man for such as are without. But 1. An ordinary Preacher of the Word as a privat Christian, is a Preacher unknown to Scripture. 2. And one and that same man Preaching at that same time, as a Minister to some, and as a privat man to other hearers, is far more uncouth to scripture. I beleve a Minister by Scripture rule, ought in his ordinary and publick Preaching of the Word, to act and Preach as a Minister, and to be wholly taken up with the work of his Ministry: For to that he is appointed of God, and commanded to look to and fulfill, *Eph. 4. 12. Collos. 4. 17. 2 Tim. 4. 2.*

S³ 11.

2. It is said by some of them that they will receive any in whom they see the least thing of Christ, and therefore there is no such hazard of holding out persons that have not true grace in them. To this, that least thing of Christ is some outward evidence to ground a positive judgement, that the man is Regenerat. Now I inquire what is that least thing of Christ, upon sight whereof you say you will receive men? Is sober serious profession of the true Religion and faith of Christ and of subjecting a mans self to the Ordinances and Government of Christ, sufficient to you, that thereupon you will receive him? Or must there be somewhat more to make it up? If you said the former, we were at agreement, upon the matter, about the qualification necessary in *foro Ecclesie*, for admitting of persons to be Church members: but this you acknowledge not to be sufficient: Let men thus seriously and soberly

ly. professe, there must be a time for observing their conversation, and their must be a tryall and searching into the experimentall work in their hearts : Now if it must be somewhat more then that I enquire, what is the least thing more ? We have seen before what they held forth in their rules of tryall, and dare say (yea thinks it were unchristian, unwarrantable rigidnesse to say the contrary) that there may be and are many honest, sincere Converts, in whom there is not to be seen by others, and who cannot shew to others, that which they hold forth as the least, more then that which we have said ; and therefore still by their way many truly Regenerat may be held forth, tho desirous of Church communion, and offering subjection to the Word and Ordinances of Christ, for my part, I had rather, twenty hypocrites were let in, then that one gracious soul, yea or Elect, tho yet not Regenerat, come this far on, as to desire to be in, and to professe subjection, should be held forth, and yet this accurate and pretended cleanly way of these Brethren, tho it tend to exclude many, who may be are truly Regenerat, yet it may let in any unregenerat, if they can but play the Hypocrite handsomely, and have some Book-learned knowledge.

Argument 7. Shall be taken from these descriptions of the S. 32.
Visible Church in the Word of God holding it forth to us frequently as a mixed society of good and bad, under the similitudes of a barn floore, wherein is an heap of wheat and chaffe, *Mat. 13.* of a corn field wherein are growing together tares and wheat, *Chap. 13.* 24. of a draw-net gathering in good fish and bad, *ibid. vers. 47.* &c. and of a great house wherein are vessels of Gold and Silver, and vessels of Wood and Earth, *2 Tim. 2.* 21. I confesse this Argument hath not been well managed against the opposites, which has given them occasion to slight it, as proving nothing but what themselves grant. For when no more is alledged from these places, but that the Visible Church is such a society, as even when rightly constitute, there are in it a mixture of true beleevers and hypocrites, they say they yeeld the Argument wholly, that in the purest Visible Churches, there may and will alwayes be a mixture of hypocrites with true beleevers and Saints, *de facto*: but that the Question is what sort of persons ought, *de jure* to be admitted or

permitted to be members of the Visible Church. But the places duly pondered and considered together will afford us a more pungent Argument, which will not leave open a way for such an escape. We present it thus in form: if the Lord himself describing the outward constitution of the Visible Church, as to the matter whereof it consisteth; not only holdeth it forth as a mixed society of some truly good, and gracious, and some bad unconverted and graceless ones: But also declareth that his will is that his servants should not cast out of it all such as they conceive to be bad and unconverted; but that they permit even such in the outward Visible Church, leaving to himself to make the full separation of the one from the other: Then it cannot be that by his appointment and institution, it should be the necessary qualification of Visible Church-members, *in foro Ecclesiastico*, that they be all true converts and gracious ones; at least, so far as men can discern and judge, this proposition if the consequence and connexion thereof hold good; leaves no door open for the former escapes, as is evident: and I conceive that the connexion or consequence of it, is undenyable, because upon the supposition of the opposite of the consequent follows clearly the opposite of the antecedent, that is to say, if it were Christs institution and will that true grace, at least, so far as men can discern and judge, should be the necessary qualification, *in foro Ecclesiastico*, of all Church-members, it should clearly follow that it were his will, and the duty of his servants to cast out all such in the Visible Church, as they did see not to be qualified, not gracious converts, which is flatly contrary to that which is supposed in the antecedent. Now I assume that the antecedent is clearly held forth to us in these places. 'Tis clear that in these places he holdeth forth the Visible Church in its outward constitution as to the matter thereof, to be a mixed society of good and bad, truly gracious and such as are void of true grace, and not only this, but 2. That not only he permits it to be so until the last day: But also 'tis his will and he commands his servants to permit such to abide in the Church as even to their discerning are bad, leaving the separation of them to himself at the last. *The servants said unto him: wilt thou then that we go and gather them up?* Yes, would Mr. Lockier say, leave not one of them; No not one

one of them in a Visible Church; they are where they ought not to be, they want the complexion of the Visible Church, &c. But sayeth the Lord himself: Nay, but let both grow together untill the Harvest.

Objct. If it shall be objected against this exposition and application of this place, that hereby it should follow that any profane ones ought to be permitted to be members of the Visible Church, which in consequence is contrary to Christs institution of Ecclesiastick Discipline enjoying incorrigible offenders to be cast out and Excommunicat; and that therefore by these tares must be understood *latent hypocrites*, which may be such in appearance, as may charitably be judged by men true beleivers. *Ans.* It cannot be that such latent hypocrites as these only are understood: Why? They are such tares as are seen and known by the servants; they must therefore be such as falls into sins and whose badnesse is obvious to the senses of others, yet there is no contradiction between this of *Mat.* 13. 29. so understood, and that of *Mat.* 18. *vers.* 17. We may say as *Augustine* on the same places against *Donatists*, *Domino in Evangelio dicenti in illo obtemperare debemus ubi ait, si neque Ecclesiam audieris sit tibi tanquam Ethnicus & Publicanus, & in illo, ubi prohibuit colligi Zizania ne simul eradicetur & triticum, potest enim utrumque custodiri:* The reason is because they may well be conceived to speak not *ad idem*, in respect to these same sort of persons. The command of Excommunication is against such notorious offenders as to their offences adde contumacie against the Discipline of the Church, or at least, if it be further to be extended, whose offence is atrocious & these that offend these wayes, whether they be tares, gracelesse men, or indued with true saving grace. But there may be sinfull livers in the Visible Church seen to be such by the servants, who falls not under either of these two sorts.

The Doctrinall notes which the Reverend Mr. *Dickson* hath upon that Parable, *Mat.* 13. 24. &c. are worthy the reading and consideration to this purpose we are on, and they are genuine and naturally flowing from the place. The Book is common, so that I need not transcribe all; I shall but bring two or three of them for such as may be has not the Book at hand. 1. The externall Visible Church

Church is worthy to be called the Kingdome of Heaven even in respect of the externall constitution of it in the world notwithstanding the wicked hypocrites in it; because therein Christ rules as King, and hath his Subjects, all professing him to be King of Saints.

4. It is mater of grief and offence to see in the Church of Christ so many unprofitable weeds ——— 5. The rash zeal of servants before they consult their Lord and Master is ready with the hazard of the Church and true members thereof, to have such a constitution of the Visible Church as they should suffer none to be a member, who are not inwardly Regenerat: But have all others of whose inward Regeneration they are not assured plucked from among Professours.

6. The Lord although he hath given order to censure scandalous offenders, yet he discharges his servants to presse towards such a separation, as to have all weeds and wicked in heart to be cast out; Least while they gather out the gracelesse tares, they should root out also the gracious wheat with them: For it is not possible for any man to discern the renewed from the unrenewed so clearly but he may be mistaken. 8. The mixture in the Visible Church, Christ the Lord is minded to permit and commands to be permitted till the day of Judgement, and then, but not till then, shall a full separation of the godly and the wicked, of the Elect and Reprobat be made; *In the time of Harvest I will say gather the Wheat, &c.* See also his note on the ver. 47.

This Parable teacheth us, that the Visible Church, in the way of gathering members, and in the manner of constitution thereof, it is like a draw-net taking in all who professe subjection to Christ and his Ordinances, good and bad, true and false Professours, for it gathereth of every kinde, to wit, whosoever professe faith in, and promise subjection to Christ.

S. 37. *Argument* 8. The Doctrine which excludes the Infants of Christians from being members of the Visible Church, cannot be from Christ nor have any truth in it. But Mr. Lockiers Doctrine concerning the mater of the Visible Church excludes the Infants of Christians from being members of the Visible Church, *go &c.* For the proof of the proposition I refer Mr. Lockier to Mr. Bawers Dispute against Tombs: If he deny that Infants of Christians are members of the Visible Church, let him take some pains to answer

answer these many, solid and acute Arguments brought by that Learned man, to prove that they are. The assumption is most clear. For Mr. Lockiers Doctrine is that none others, no nor one other, are fit mater of a Visible Church, but such as are truly converted: so far as men truly converted and very spirituall are able to discern and judge: This is a thing that cannot be spoken or understood of infants. And it is remarkable that Mr. Lockier now here when he propoundeth his Doctrine concerning the mater of the Visible Church, nor else where in prosecuting it in this Lecture, does so much as once, with these whom he allowes to be mater of the Visible Church, take in their Infants, as some others of his mind are wont sometimes to do. And therefore that which Mr. Candrie sayeth, considering Mr. Hookers conclusion concerning the mater of the visible Church that had he not added a little after, *comprehending the Infants of considerat believers under their Parents Covenant*, he might have been suspected, &c. Mr. Lockier having altogether left this out, I may say it of him positively, he is justly to be suspected of concurring with Anabaptists whose Doctrine concerning the mater of a Church is the very same with his.

Having added some reasons from Scripture, to these which Mr. Lockier was pleased to take into consideration (besides which he may find sundry others, in other Divines, who have Written on this Subject, as namely, Reverend M. *Rutherford*, *Apollonius*, his consideration of sundry Controversies, &c. and *Spanhemius* his Epistle to *David Buchanan*) I might adde a large enough Catalogue of Testimonies from Orthodox Divines, both ancient, especially in their Writings against Novatians, and Donatists, and Moderne, since Reformation of Religion from Poperie. But being of the mind of that Reverend and Learned man, who said, he esteemed more of one Testimony of Scripture, then of ten reasons, and of one solid reason, more then of ten humane testimonies, I will spare to fill up Paper this way, only this I may say, that our opposites have the whole stream of Orthodox and Reformed Divines against them, Let the Learned *Ames*. (a man in some other points too much inclining to the Independent Tenents) speak for this: *Bellar. Encrvat. Tom. 3. lib. 2. c. 1. 11. §. falsum est* (faith

(sayeth he) *internas virtutes, equiri à nobis ut aliquis sit in Ecclesia, quoad Visibilem ejus statum. i.e.* its false that inward virtues or graces are required by us, that one may be in the Church as to its visible state: And he had good reason to say so: for we shall find all Orthodox Reformed Divines, alwise defining the Visible Church by outward Profession of the true Christian faith or Religion, and externall communion in the Worship and Ordinances of God: But never by inward holinesse and hearty conversion. Thus I have done with Mr. Lockiers Lecture.



A P P E N D I X,

Wherein is Examined so much of that Letter Written by these of ABERDENE, who lately have separated from this Church upon the INDEPENDENT grounds, as relateth to the present Question touching the necessary qualification of Visible Church-members.

- S. 1. **L**AST Summer some persons, Ministers, and others in *Aberdene*, did Write a Letter of the date, 24. of *May*, to some Godly men in the South, declaring their separation from the communion of the Church of *Scotland*, upon two points of Controversie between us and these of the Independent way, *viz.* the constitution of the Visible Church, and the Government thereof, contrary to their solemn Vowes made to Almighty God in two Covenants, the Nationall Covenant of this Kirk, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the three Kingdomes, and undertaken with solemn declaration of their conviction in Conscience of the truth of Religion, professed in this Church, and under the pains of Gods everlasting wrath, and of infamie and of losse of all honour and respect

to the following of the same Church, and that they were
thereby, and by the same Church, made full professing
Christians, and that they were, by the same Church,
behaviour and conduct, and that they were, by the same
of their admission to be Christians, and that they were,
seen and found, with the same Church, and that they were,
with the Gospel-like teaching, and that they were,
them, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
the Gospel-like teaching, and that they were, by the same Church,
to their joy and comfort, and that they were, by the same Church,
Gospel-like teaching, and that they were, by the same Church,
by the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,

the profession of the Christian religion, and that they were,
behaviour and conduct, and that they were, by the same Church,
admitted members of the Christian Church. - Consider
between you and the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
called and referred to the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,

S-1.

But now we come to the question of the same Church, and that they were,
Such (say they) are the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
(which ought to be preserved as) and that they were, by the same Church,
such a Church, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
for Answer, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
Argument, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
all and every one of the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
least such as are mentioned in the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
consisting of such members, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
in the positive judgement, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
about gathering, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
and taken in under the notion of such, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
to be such. But 1. To put so much as is said in the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
that they were gathered and constituted, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
for them take them as they will, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
Do not suppose their titles should import that the same Church, and that they were, by the same Church,
they are given with necessity consisting of such, and that they were, by the same Church, and that they were,
were all and every one such. Does it follow that all and every one

[illegible]

first, that the other is a part of the matter of the exhortation
 of them, thus: That persons who are bound to flee fornication
 by an Argument taken from Redemption as their condition are cal-
 led redeemed by the Apostle: But all these to whom that exhor-
 tation is directed are exhorted by an Argument taken from that
 condition. Therefore, Now that is answered, I think the
 assumption of the first dilemma may well be denied, viz. that
 exhortation is directed to all and every one in the Church of Co-
 rinth; the Author proves not; Only they think it so evident,
 that none will deny it. But for what reason they are so confident
 of this I know not, but I think, that being exhortation was a
 duty incumbent on them all and every one of them. But this
 reason is not conclusive: for why may not a duty, which is in
 a common obligation incumbent to all, be pressed upon some pe-
 culiar persons by an exhortation particularly intended and directed
 for them? I will for an example in the Text here, why we
 may not take that exhortation, where a duty of common obli-
 gation, yet particularly intended and directed by the Apostle to
 the elect and truly called amongst them, not distinctly by the
 head and name pointing them out, but *confuse*, in the Visible So-
 ciety they were engaged. 1. Passing that assumption of the first
 dilemma: the assumption of the second which is brought to prove
 the major of the first is as loose, viz. that all these persons to
 whom the exhortation is directed, or are exhorted to flee fornication,
 are exhorted by that Argument taken from redemption as
 their condition. This may well be denied, for they may not in
 exhortation to a common duty, directed to the whole Society mixed
 of persons of different spirituall conditions, be pressed upon all by
 some Argument common to all (such as that whereby this exhor-
 tation is pressed, *et c.* 18.) and upon some, by some speciall Ar-
 gument relating specially to them. There can be no circumstance
 of the context alleged to prove, why it may not be conceived to
 be so here, supposing that the exhortation is directed to all. But,
 3. To bear out the bottom of this Argument, I prove from the very
 Text it self that the Apostle here speaking to the persons whom he
 calleth redeemed, speaketh of them as such in the very of the
 thing or object, as truly and really redeemed and consequently
 cannot

cannot be conceived to speak it of all and every one in the Church of *Corinth*, as the Authors themselves will confesse, I doubt not. I prove it thus, these whom the Apostles calls Redeemed here, they are such as might and ought themselves to know, and be assured that they were Redeemed, and had the Spirit of God dwelling in them. But only such as are in reality and the *verity* of the thing, Redeemed, &c. may and ought to know and be assured of this of themselves. Therefore the second Part of this Argument is clear, because otherwise a man might and ought to know and be assured of a lie, concerning his estate, which is deluded presumption. The first part is also clear from the Apostles words, *v. 19. What? know ye not that your bodies are the Temples of the Holy Ghost, &c.* That *know ye not* so frequently used by the Apostle, especially in these Epistles to the *Corinthians*, and in this very Chapter five times, imports a certain assurance of the thing he is speaking of, and therefore here the Apostle imports that these whom he is speaking to as redeemed, and having the Spirit dwelling in them, they are such as may and ought to be assuredly sensible that they were redeemed. And is not this place parallel to that of the very like expression, *2 Cor. 13. 5. Know ye not that Christ is in you?* Which all Protestant Divines presse against Papists for proving Believers certain assurance and perswasion of grace and salvation. Therefore I conclude: That the Apostle by these whom he calls the Temple of the Holy Ghost, understands them that are such indeed and in truth of the object, and not in the judgment of charity; And what an incongruous interpretation were it to put upon these words, *Know ye not that ye are the temples of the Holy Ghost redeemed with a price?* this sense; *Know ye not that ye are accounted in the judgment of charity, temples of the Holy Ghost, &c.* 4. Yet I think it cannot in truth be said that all and every one in the Church of *Corinth* were judged positively by the Apostle in the judgment of charity, gracious, renewed and sanctified ones, even because of the grosse wickednesse he in these Epistles expresseth himself to have known to be amongst them.

The last exception the Authors of the Epistle goes about to obviate thus, *Neither hath it any weight with us to the contrair which is objected that there were grosse faulces amongst them, as di-*

57.

*visions, intemperance, questioning the Resurrection, incest; Will not Lots denunciate, Davids adultery, Peters denial, prove these to be sins incident to the Saints, tho' justly censurable, as the incestuous was excommunicate: a man who once, as is spoken of Gaius, hath been approved of the truth it self, though he be over-demonstrated with grosse infirmities, albeit for it he be censurable according to the nature of his offence, yea the highest Ecclesiastick Censure passe against him; yet he is to be esteemed as a brother, 2 Thel. 3. 15. Answ. 1. Tho' that objected, hath not with you, yet has it had with many judicious and godly men in the Church of God, both ancient and moderne, much weight to the contrair: I name, for the present but one (there be no doubt of many others) because of the Controversie he is upon in making use of this consideration. The godly Orthodox and ancient *Augustine, ad Donatistas post collationem, cap. 21.* where disputing against the *Donatists* maintaining separation from all other Christian Churches, because of the mixture of many wicked ones amongst them from that place, *2 Cor. 6. 14, 15, 16, 17.* (just as these Authors of this Epistle do afterward from that same very place, *ut non sit ovum & sic alloqui ovo similis*) answers them from the consideration of these many grosse wickednesses expressed by the Apostle as abounding in that Church, that there were many gracelesse persons amongst them, yet they neither made nor were commanded to make separation from that Church. I humbly desire the judicious Reader to be thos sic A- at the pains to read the whole Chap. and I shall but point at two or three remarkable Passages of it, here see the Margine.*

Paulus vocavit Iesu Christi per voluntatem Dei. & sothene: frater Ecclesie qua est Corinthi sanctificavit in Iesu Christo vocavit sanctis. Quia hoc audiens credas in Ecclesia Corinthiorum esse aliquos reprobos quandoquidem verba ista sic sonant velut ad omnes directas sit laudatio? Et tamen paulo post dicit: Obsecro autem fratres, ut id ipsum dicatis omnes. & non sitis in vobis schismata. — In istis etiam Corinthiis ibi erant qui non credebant resurrectionem mortuorum: qua singularis fides est Christianorum — Auendamus verba ista quibus Corinthiorum Ecclesiam in principio Epistole sic laudat: ut dicat: Gratias ago Deo meo semper pro vobis in gratia Dei qua data est vobis in Christo Iesu, quia in omnibus divites facti estis — Ecce sic etiam dicit in Christo in omni verbo & in omni scientia ita ut in nihil deesse in ulla gratia, ut in illis essent qui resurrectionem mortuorum adhuc usque non crederent &c. where it is most evident that this learned and godly Father expounds these words of saints &c. given to the Church of Corinth. not of all and every one, but of a part thereof and that upon this very consideration that there were amongst them persons guilty of such wickedness as are afterwards fallen upon by the Apostle to whom his minde is, these others were not competent.

But

But waving the Authority of men, let us consider the things themselves, and see if the Authors have not, as it would seem, strained themselves here, to make this consideration appear light unto them. Then, 2. Let it be observed that in the account of these grosse wickednesses that were amongst the *Corinthians* alledged as a ground against their assertion, that all and every one in the Church of *Corinth* were such as were judged true Saints in the positive judgement of charity by the Apostles, some maine grosse faults are omitted, and some of them reckoned up, are minced by them. First I say some are omitted: as for example, vain carnall abuse unto ostentation of the gifts of the Spirit with which the Apostle meeteth, 1 *Cor.* 12, 13, 14. vile envying, traducing, and labouring by all means to disgrace and bring in disgust amongst them the blessed Apostle and his Ministry: Read, 2 *Cor.* 10. and 11. and 12. and consider what was the practices of these amongst the *Corinthians*, against whom the Apostle vindicates himself, and say if they were such as the Apostle judged true Saints, may does he, not in expresse tearms, *Cap.* 11. *ver.* 13, 14, 15. say of them that they were false Apostles, deceitfull workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ, Satans Ministers, transforming themselves as the Ministers of Righteousnesse, whose end should be according to their works. Again some of them reckoned up are minced. Not only were there amongst them intemperance simply, but coming drunk to the Lords table, 1 *Cor.* 11. 21, 22. and 'tis spoken of as a thing ordinary and habituall in them; not simply committing of fornication, but impudent slighting of it as little or no sin at all, as appears, 1 *Cor.* 6. not simple questioning (as they Interpret it) i.e. doubting about the Resurrection, but downright positive denying of it, 1 *Cor.* 15. How say some among you that there is no Resurrection of the dead. Now could the Authors hearts endure to parallell such habituall drunkennesse and whoredome with *Lots* and *Dauids* lapses through the surprizall of such temptations as they were under: Such hereticall denying of a most fundamentall point of Religion, the Resurrection from the dead, with *Peters* denyall, of a matter of fact, his knowledge and acquaintance with Christ (which yet was a grievous sin on the matter) under the violence of a temptation, as if these former, as

* Martyr: in loc. Eor non omni notitia Dei excuit sed tantum loquitur de ea notitia que saluare est et ad regenerationem conducit, ignorare autem Deum hoc nomine se scire declarabans, quod resurrectionis inficiabatur.

well as these latter, were to be accounted but infirmities of Saints? Nay, albeit I deny not, but atheistical doubtings may arise and infect the hearts of gracious ones (which yet are a torment to them) yet I see not how a formed deniall of that fundamentall point of the Resurrection, now since Christs Resurrection, and so cleare and full revelation of the Gospel, can be consistig in the heart with true saving faith; And is it not upon this very account that the Apostle speaking to these *Corinthians* in that 15. cap. vers. 34. sayeth, *some* (he means of their Church, as the *Nether Dutch Notes* well observe) *have not the knowledge of God, i.e.* they have not saving knowledge of God. 2. What shall we yet say that the Apostle judged all and every one in the Church of *Corinth* truly gracious Saints. 3. As to that, a man who once spoken of as *Gains*, &c. 1. 'Tis true that such a man, though he be overtaken with a grosse infirmity, and therefore be censurable and censured with the censure of Excommunication, yet is not for that; to losse the estimation we had of him before upon such grounds; but what is this to the purpose in hand? Have the Authors shown us, or can they shew us any evidence or proof that these mentioned in the *Corinth.* as guilty of these grosse wickednesses, were such as *Gains* is said to have been, approven of the truth it self: yea or positively in charity judged true Saints and Regenerat? To suppose this, (as the Authors do but suppose it here) is not hing else but to suppose and beg the thing in Question without any proof of it. 2. I conceive the Authors are in a mistake, when as they take that, 2 *Thes.* 3. 3. *esteem* him (it is, *admonish* him, in the text) *as a brother*, to import necessarily the accounting a man one truly Regenerat; For in Christianity as there is a speciall brotherhood in regard of communion in Regenerating grace; so there is a common brotherhood, in regard of common profession of Christian Faith and Religion, and it is sufficient to understand a *brother* in that place, in that more common notion and relation, as is evident by the opposition there made to an enemy. Tho I think the Apostle there is not so much speaking of the state of the man censured, what it is, or ought to be judged; As what the affection and carriage of these yet in the Church ought to be towards him for his good. Thus we have seen and considered

ted the first ground brought by the Authors for their Thesis, taken from the examples of the Churches founded by the Apostles and the confirmation brought to hold it up.

Their is ere they come to the next, this word casten in, *but this is not our case; our Churches are overflowed with a deluge of prophane Atheists, who have been such from their birth to this present hour, which I can no otherwise look upon in this place of their Epistle, but as an antinous eruption of despite against their mother Church.* Afterward such as it is, it might have come in its place, when they come to speak to the point of their practice of separation from this Church: But here in this place of their Epistle, they are upon the question *de jure*, of what members Churches Visible ought to be constitute, what is it to this purpose that these Churches have *de facto*, such and such persons in them? But now to their second ground: John (say they) *thought not a bare verbal profession sufficient ground to admit persons to Baptism.* These who came to him to be Baptized, unless he saw joyned with it fruits meet for Repentance, and upon this score he could not (I reason from his fact or pra, tice to conclude the *jus* or rule, therefore knowing some of the Authors acute enough to see such a thing, I conceive, it has been first written would not, and that the other is an escape of the transcriber.) *he would not, see the reason of my conjecture, on the Margine*) admit the Pharisees who came to him to be baptized, as is clear, comp. Mat. 3. with Luke 7. 30. the Pharisees were not baptized of John. If it be replied that Christ in Luke speaks only of some of the Pharisees, the scope of the Text will easily refuse it. For he chides the Pharisees as worse than the Publicans, in this, that the Publicans came to Johns baptism in a capacity to be baptized and were baptized of him, which the Pharisees did not. But if these many Pharisees, Mat. 3. 7. had been baptized of John; and only some others of them rejected his baptism, surely the Pharisees in this had been nothing behind the Publicans, for neither were all the Publicans baptized.

In this Argument, these Authors have no small confidence as appeareth, once for all then to vindicate this place from their forgery. 1. Whereas they say John Baptist thought not a bare verbal profession sufficient to admit these to Baptism who came to him to be Baptized, unless he found joyned with it fruits meet for Repentance. *Ans.* 1. 'Tis not a bare verbal profession that we plead for as a sufficient ground, nor say we that John Baptist proceeded

* For if it be, he could not, it must be meant *de jure*, as we say, *il-lud possumus quod de jure possumus.* For to deny that Physic he could were but false & impertinent; but that were to beg the question: for now they are reasoning from his fact or pra, tice to conclude the *jus* or rule, therefore knowing some of the Authors acute enough to see such a thing, I conceive, it has been first written would not, and that the other is an escape of the transcriber. §. 8.

ceeded upon it as a ground in admitting persons to his baptism, a bare verball profession may be apparently in jest, mocking, and in grosse palpable hypocrisie. *John* no doubt would not thought such a profession a sufficient ground: nor do we think it either. But between such a profession, and a profession wherewith are seen presently and actually fruits meet for Repentance, i. e. positively evidencing and proving true Repentance in the heart; there is a profession sober and serious, tho for the present there be not, nor can be for the present, seen such fruits; meet for Repentance joynted with it, such a Profession we say as this, is a sufficient ground to admit to Baptisme upon; And upon such a Profession, we say *John* admitted those to baptisme, that came to him to be baptized, without enquiring or waiting to see fruits meet for Repentance. For it is most evident by comparing the Evangelists, *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, yea and *John* 3. 23. that great multitudes of people coming to him were baptized by him together, at the same time. Now I pray how did *John* see fruits meet for Repentance in all and every one of these by themselves? was he acquaint with every one of their conversations personall, before they came there, who will be so impudent as to hazard upon such an assertion especially, of him who lived in the wilderness remote from their Cities and Societies? Or after they came forth to him and offered themselves to be baptized, did *John* delay their baptism and they abide in conversing with him, so long a time (which could not be for some few dayes, yea or weeks) as he might see such fruits in their conversation, viz. (as the Authors of this way tell us) omitting no known duty, and committing no known evil; or leading a conversation without scandall? Who will say or beleve this either? Or did *John* see these, by examining every one of them severally, and causing them make a declaration of the experimentall work of Repentance upon their heart? 1. But how could he do this, with so great multitudes, yea when all is done, this would be nothing but verball profession of the work, and not fruits, spoken of in the Text, which are reall good works and practices in life and conversation. And as to their hinting at the *Baptists* words, *bring forth fruits meet for Repentance*: As if it were imported thereby, that *John* is requiring the works to be brought forth, and that he might see

see them in relation unto, and before his administration of baptism to them, is a grosse mistake or deceit; for it is evident that John is not requiring a qualification in relation to his administration of baptism to them; But Preaching their duty, without which neither their profession nor outward baptism, nor any other outward privilege or prerogative should save them from the wrath of God. Yea it is evident that this Sermon exhortatorie was so far from being Preached to the purpose the Authors intimates, that it was Preached either in the time of the administration, or rather after the administration was performed. As would appear by *Mark* 1. 8. *I indeed have baptized you*.

But they prove that John Baptized not, but upon seeing fruits meet for Repentance joyned with Profession. How? upon this score (not seeing fruits meet for Repentance with their profession) he could (it should be would) not admit the Pharisees who came to him to be baptized. *Answ.* 1. I know Reverend *Pareus* thinks these Pharisees were not admitted to Baptisme by John: but he gives not this as the ground of Johns debarring them; not seeing in them fruits meet for Repentance, but this, that they came out of curiosity, or maliciousnesse, to disturb his Ministry: and were manifest hypocrites: and we confesse if any were known to be such, they ought to be debarred, and that to administer Sacraments to such were to prostitute them, as that Reverend Author sayeth, for such are known mockers and despisers of the Ordinances. But there may be a profession not of this kind, with which yet there is not, at the present, seen joyned fruits, positively evidencing the sound work of Repentance in the heart. 2. Most part of commentators are of a judgement contrare to that of *Pareus*, that they were not debarred, see these on the Margine: * and truly to me there appeareth nothing in the Text against it, but rather somewhat for it, that these Pharisees that came to him then were

* Observe, that these two verses, *Luk* 7. 29, 30 by some are taken to be spoken by Christ himself as part of his discourse concerning John Baptist, and so our present Authors of the Epistle take them. By others they are taken to be the words of the Evangelist, expressing the different effect, that Christs discourse concerning John had upon diverse hearers, viz. that the common people and very Publicans hearing that discourse glorified God, having been such as were before baptized of John: but the Pharisees despised it and rejected it being such as were not baptized by John: we will not now discuss which of the two are most probable, the former interpretation is the more common.

Baptized by him: for that sharp obijurgation, O generation of
evilers, &c. on which weight may be laid, was spoken not only
 to the Pharisees (though in speciall way it was to them) but to
 the whole multitude of the people. *Luke 3. 7.* Nay doth not *John*
 in the prosecution of this discourse directed in speciall way to the
 Pharisees say, *I baptize you?* yet in *Mark*, *I have baptized*
you? If any shall say this was not one discourse, with that going
 before, because *Luke* sayeth that he uttered the last point as the
 people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts, &c.
 I say this proveth not that it was another discourse, or that there
 was any interruption or intervall of time intervening: it only
 sheweth that upon consideration of these thoughts in mens hearts
 concerning this, as a speciall reason, he uttered this point, which
 yet as appears by the context, and all other interpreters take it, he
 spoke also for the Doctrine of Baptisme, to shew what be-
 longed to him as the externall Minister of it, and what to Christ as
 the principall Cause and Author.

- S. 10. But see we how our Authors will prove, that these Pharisees that
 came to *John*, were not admitted by him, and that upon this
 score, as not seeing (*viz.* at that time, so we must circumstan-
 tiate the matter) in them fruits meet for Repentance joynd with
 their Profession. 'Tis clear (say they) if we compare *Matth.*
3. with *Luke 7. 3.* the Pharisees were not baptized of *John*. Ans. 1.
 Suppose it were granted that this were meant Universally of the
 Pharisees and so of those that came to *John*, *Matth. 3.* with the
 rest: Yet were proven but the half of that which was alleadged,
viz. that they were not admitted by him to baptisme. But no-
 thing is brought for the other half, *viz.* that it was upon this
 score, *viz.* because he saw not fruits meet for repentance with their
 Profession. Might it not be that he admitted them not, nor upon
 that negative ground, but upon this positive; Because he saw them
 coming out of curiositie or maliciousnesse, or jesting, and not so
 much as in sober seriousnesse. Nay take these verses, 29. 30. as a
 continuat part of Christs speech concerning *John*, (as our present
 Authors takes them) and not so much is proven, *viz.* that *John*
 refused to admit them. They import rather, that they them-
 selves refused to be baptized, despised and rejected his baptisme;
 Then

Then that he refused to baptize them desiring to be baptized, and so interpreters commonly, especially those that take these verses to be a part of Christs speech, understand them. But 2. take these verses as you will, I see not how it appears clearly by them, that these Pharisees that came to *John*, *Math. 3.* were not baptized by him. For take them as the Evangelists words (as it seemeth very probable they should be, comparing them with *Math. 11. 15.* and the beginning of *ver. 31.* of that 7. of *Luke*) then they are meant of such Pharisees as were present hearing Christs discourse concerning *John*; and the meaning is this much, The Pharisees that were present hearing this discourse of Christ, not being baptized of *John*, &c. Now can this be brought to prove that the Pharisees that came to *John*, *Math. 3.* were not baptized: unlesse you will say, that all the Pharisees in Judea, yea in the world, were present hearing that discourse; Which is neither said in the Text, nor any wayes likely they could be present. And take them as a continue part of Christs discourse concerning *John*, and supposing also that it were meant that *John* debarred them from baptism (the contrary whereof, that themselves rejected, despised it, and would not be baptized by him, is likely to be meant, as we said a little before) yet it is not clear thereby that these Pharisees that came to *John*, *Math. 3.* were not baptized, because the proposition is but indefinite, and so may be verified tho understood particularly; And if so, what evidence have we from the words that these that came to *John* were the men. Judicious Interpreters, by name *Musculus* and *Arcerius*, expressly comparing the one place with the other, affirm they are not the same particular persons spoken of in both.

Against what is said in the last place, our present Authors say, §. 11. The scope of the context will easily refuse it: for Christ chideth the Pharisees as worse in this, &c. *Ans.* 'Tis easier for men to say, that their Adversary is easily refuted, then to do it. 1. It is likely as we shew before, that in these verses 29, 30. 'tis not Christ that speaketh, chiding the Pharisees as worse that way then the Publicans: But *Luke* expressing how the people and Publicans present upon the one hand, and the Pharisees on the other, were affected with Christs discourse concerning *John*. But 2. let them be Christs own words, it will not be found by the context that it is Christs

scope to chide the Pharisees he speaketh of here for this, that coming to be baptized, they came in an incapacity, and for that incapacity were refused Baptism by *Iohn*, tho' desirous (which they should have proven, and not begged) but for this, that they *would not* be baptized by him; For the words are not, that they rejected the counsell of God, and *Iohn* baptizeth them not, or therefore were not baptized of him: but they rejected the counsell of God, themselves not being baptized by him. *2. 28. 29.* Take these words as uttered by Christ speaking on in a continue discourse, And what can a man conceive to be the meaning of them, but this simply, that they put away, despised, rejected the means of salvation ordained by God (that is his counsell) and made known by his Minister *Iohn*, and this was an evidence of it, that they were not baptized by him. But, 3. To the point we are on more nearly here; let it be granted which the Authors sayes, that he chideth the Pharisees for that cause they alledged; The consequence built upon it, to prove that these Pharisees that came to *Iohn*, *Mat. 3.* were not baptized, is feeble: For it must be thus, Christ chideth the Pharisees as worse then the Publicans, for this, that when as the Publicans came in a capacity to be baptized and were baptized. The Pharisees did not so. Ergo, none of the Pharisees were baptized; & so neither were these mentioned, *Mat. 3.* I deny the consequence. For the antecedent may be true, and Christs chiding the Pharisees, generally, reasonable and just, tho' some of them had been other-ways affected and thereupon baptized. As for the reason of the consequence brought by the Authors, *if these many Pharisees, Mat. 3. 7. &c.* The whole strength of it lyes in a sophisticall insinuation, that these Pharisees, *Mat. 3.* because they are said to be many, were the greatest part of all the Pharisees, and these being said to be baptized there were but some few beside, of whom these words, *Luke 7. 30.* (*they were not baptized*) could be expounded, this I say is but a meer sophisticall insinuation: for albeit these, *Mat. 3.* be called many, yet their might been Pharisees many more, ten to one beside, of whom that *Luke 7. 30.* might be said. Now considering that the Publicans and other such common people tho' all of them were not baptized of *Iohn*, yet generally they shew themselves more obedient and respective to the Ordinance

Ordinances Ministred by *John*, as also they did unto Christ himself, then the Pharisees did, albeit some of them also might be disobedient to him and not baptized by him, it may be clearly enough seen, that the Pharisees were much behind them in this, and that Christ might justly chide the Pharisees as worse then the Publicans, for the cause mentioned (speaking of them indefinitely) tho all and every one of them had not been in the blame. This is not unusuall in comparing two sorts, orders or conditions of persons, to blame the one as worse then the other in such a particular respect (in an indefinite speech) when the one is more generally blame-worthy that way, then the other, tho, may be, some of the party blamed are free of the fault, and some of the party commended, may be deep enough in that fault. This much for clearing *John Baptists* procedure in admitting persons to baptism, viz. that he did baptize persons coming to him upon their first profession, without delay or waiting for discoveries of true heart Conversion and Saintship in them.

Having ended this Argument from *John's* order of baptizing they tell us that, *many more and more pressing grounds from the Word might be alledged to make forth this point: But we are loath (say they) to be tedious: only sure wee are, holinesse becomes the House of our God. It is certain our Churches are not constituted according to this rule in the full extent of it; Yea also few of our most precious men will acknowledge it to be the rule.* *Ans.* 1. Albeit the Authors conceiving to their knowledge *many more grounds* to be in the Word of God for making forth their point and having set down here but some few of them, omitting the rest, might, without incurring the hazard of animadversion, alledged that they passed these others, being loath to be tedious, because to wit they were writing an Epistle, not a Tractat: Yet their purpose being in this Epistle, to give an account of their thoughts (as they say in the beginning) in this matter to some Godly men: I humbly conceive, that when as they say, that there might be alledged *more pressing grounds* (which I doubt not but they speak as even to their own knowledge) for their point then they have alledged, but they are loath to be tedious by setting them down: This censure might justly be put upon it, that either it is an open writing

S. 12

themselves with their own pen, knowingly, foolish wrongers of their own cause; When as purposing to pick out some few grounds of many, for giving an account of their belief to men, whom they would give some satisfaction to, and draw to their judgement and side, they leave out the grounds that are most pressing for making out their point: But verily I think some of them, at least, not so simple as to have committed wittingly and willingly such an error; Or it is, give us leave to say it, a meer windy word, to say the least, and moderately uttered. And how sinfull a thing it is, so to speak, especially in matters of this kind, they are not ignorant. 2. But is that word, *Psal. 93. ult. Holiness becometh thine House for ever*, hinted at to close up the matter, one of these more pressing grounds, for making forth their point? O! but first this is an Old Testament Scripture spoken in relation to the then Churches of the Old Testament (whatever the place importeth) as well as to the Gospel Churches. Now why then did you before, as seems with your Master, restrict your Doctrine concerning the qualification of Church members to the Gospel Churches? Or if you will now disown that restriction, is it your mind, that this Holiness you plead for, was also the rule of admitting Members to the Visible Church under the Old Testament? Then sure, *Moses* was in a great fault, who walked not by this rule in his practise about Church Members as no man can deny. Far be it from you to say it, Brethren, when the Lord hath given him a Testimony that he was faithfull in all his house. 3. We shall not here mention the diverse interpretations of these Words of the Psalm given by severall interpreters (see *Calv. Pareus in locum*) the most genuine interpretation I conceive to be; Either to take them, as our English translation renders them, *Holiness becometh thine House*; and so as holding forth the duty of these who are the Lords House. Or thus rendering them, to thy house beautifull holiness, *etc.* belongeth as their peculiar priviledge bestowed on them by thee: but whither of these wayes they be taken; they make nothing to the Authors point; Not taking them in the latter interpretation, as is evident, the Authors I beleve will not say, that God by the efficacy of his Grace works Holiness in all and every Member of the Visible Church. Nor yet taking them in the former; According

to which the simple meaning of them, is no other but that which is expressed in the latest edition of the English Annot. on the place *a holy life and conversation becomeeth them that profess themselves to be servants to so great and glorious a Majesty*, and who of us will deny this, this importeth what is the duty of all that profess themselves to be in so neer a relation to God as his House, which is to be Holy in the Truth of the thing or object, and not only so to carry it before men as to be esteemed by them in charity, which men may doe without the reality or Truth of the thing. And this we grant, that men professing themselves the people of God ought in duty, as they would answer their profession, to be truly Holy. But what is this to the point of the qualification necessarily requisite in persons *in foro Ecclesiastico* that they may be admitted to the externall fellowship of the Church? Wherefore. 3. we confesse our Churches were not constituted according to this rule; I mean of the Holinesse spoken of in that passage of the Psalm: Nor indeed could they, nor can ever any Churches in this world be so constituted: because it is true Holinesse in the reality and truth of the thing, that is spoken of, which falls not under the cognition of the Ecclesiastick court, to be a rule of admitting persons unto the constitution of the Visible Church. 4. I know not well whom they mean by these, few at least precious men whom they insinuate to acknowledge their rule: Except they mean themselves who have sinfully separated themselves from the Church of Christ. But I may say they have no cause to weep and say alas for the precious men that will not acknowledge their new rule of constituting Visible Churches: because it is a rule that God never constituted for that purpose; But they have cause to weep and say alas (which I pray God of his Grace they may do) for themselves that they have separated themselves from the Church of Christ upon the very ground that Donatists separated of old.

In the rest of the former part of their Letter they declare their purpose of separating from the Communion of this Church, and their ground of so doing, which I follow not here, it being my purpose to take unto consideration only so much of their Letter as directly concerneth the present Question I had in hand touching

S. 13.

touching the necessary qualification of Church members. I doubt not but some of these men to whom they directed that Letter has returned them a sufficient Answer upon that point of their separation. And one of them has abundantly refuted that same point in Point against Separatists, as many other Orthodox Divines has done the like, not only modern Divines in their writings against late Separatists; But also ancient against Donatists and Novatians. Certain it is and cannot be denyed by any that has any tollerable insight in the Ancients that these our Authors in their separation goes upon that same very ground that Donatists and Novatians separated of old. It was one of the Errours of these, that by fellowship with wicked and ungodly men in the Worship and Ordinances of God, others are polluted (as we may learn from *Cyprian Epist.* 51. and 52. and *August.* in his writings against *Donatists*, particularly *contra Epistolam Parmeniani*) and therefore did separate from all other Churches as defiled with such mixtures, using as an Argument and ground for them, that same very passage brought by these present Authors for themselves, 2. *Cor.* 6. As we see by *Augustin. ad Donatist. post collationem, cap. 21.* cited by us a little before, where the Godly and Learned Ancient does abundantly and solidly refute the *Donatists* abuse of that place, as he does in his severall writs against these proud Schismaticks, all their other Arguments: And I much wonder that these our Brethren (I yet say if so they will suffer themselves to be so called by us) should have licked up that Schismaticall Doctrine & practice of *Donatists*, so universally condemned by the ancient Church, and solidly refuted by the Orthodox Divines that then were. But it not being my purpose at this time to prosecute this part of their Epistle, I shall close this Appendix, adding only a word or two out of these two Ancients I have named concerning this matter. *Cyprian, Epist.* 21. written to 4. Confessours who, having been seduced into the Novatian separation and schism, had returned again to the unity of the Church, and signified the same to *Cyprian*, thus saith he to these Confessours. *Postea quam vos de carcere rediens, erroris & Haereticus error excepti, sic res erat quasi vestra gloria in carcere remansisset. Illic enim vestri nominis dignitas recedisse videbatur, quando milites Christi non ad Ecclesiam de carcere*

ceteri viderunt in quem prius cum Ecclesia laude & gratulatione
venissent: nam & si in Ecclesia videntur esse Zizanias non tamen
impediri debet aut fides aut charitas nostra, ut quoniam Zizania
in Ecclesia esse cernimus; ipsi de Ecclesia recedamus; nobis tantum
moda laborandum est ut frumentum esse possimus, ut cum capere
frumentum Dominicus condi horreis, pro opere nostro & labore
fructum capiamus. Apostolus in Epistola sua, 2 Tim. 2. dicit.

in domo autem magna non solum vasa sunt aurea, &c. —

nos operam demus & quantum possumus laboramus ut vas aureum
vel argenteum simus. Ceterum fililia vasa confringere Domi-
no soli concessum est, uni & virga ferrea data est, esse non
potest major Domino suo sevens nec quisquam sibi, quod soli filio,
pater tribuit vendicare se putet: ut ad aream ventilan-
dam & purgandam paleam ferre se iam posse aut a fru-
mento universa Zizania humano iudicio segregare. Superba est
ista obstinatio & sacrilega presumptio quam sibi furor pravus
assumit: Et dum Dominium sibi semper, plusquam misis iudiciis
disposcit, assumunt, de Ecclesia pereunt, & dum se insolenter ex-
tolunt, ipso suo humore cacati, veritatis lumen amittunt. Here

we see separation from the Church because of the mixture of
naughty persons solidly condemned and noted with a black mark
by this Godly Ancient. The like or almost the same he hath in the
Epistle immediately following that former cited. The word I would
present from Augustine is that, contra Epistolam Parmeniani,
lib. 3. cap. 1. Ab initio cum omnis pia ratio & modus Ecclesiasti-
ca Disciplina unitatem Spiritus in vinculo pacis maxime debeat
intueri quod Apostolus sufferendu invicem praecepit custodire, &
quo non custodito medicina vindicta non tantum superflua sed eti-
am perniciofa, & propterea jam nec medicina esse convincitur,
illi filii mali, qui non odio iniquitatum alienarum, sed studio con-
tentionum suarum infirmas plebes iactantia sui nominis irretitas,
vel coram irahere, vel certe dividere affectant, superbia tumidi, per-
vici, vesani, calumniis infidiosi, seditionibus turbulenti, ne lucis
in se carere ostendantur, umbram rigida severitatis obtinent,
& qua in Scripturis sanctis salva dilectionis sinceritate & custodi-
ta pacis unitate ad corrigenda fraterna etiam moderatiori curatione
praecepta sunt ad Sacrilegium Schismatis, & ad occasionem praefationis
usurpant.

usurpant.

urgent dicuntur, unde Apollonius, in *Prolegomenis* ad *Epistolam* 10. p. 10. b. Yes the very wonderful Arguments and passages of these Books against *Parmentarius* (his Answer hereto is *Refuted* 16. 1. cap. 1. expresse to be true, in *tribus* libris contra *Parment.* *Donatistam* *Carthaginensem* *Epistolam*, *successive* *Donatistam* *questio* *magna* *versatur* *&* *soluitur*, *nam* *in* *uitate* *&* *condam* *com* *munionis* *Sacramentorum* *unde* *contaminatos* *veros* (which is the very ground whereupon these our Brethren build the necessity of their separation) *&* *quoniam* *idcirco* *non* *conuenienter* *disputatur* *propter* *Ecclesiam* *et* *non* *difficile* *est* *calumnians* *Schisma* *fecerunt*. If I would bring here all that that Ancient hath against this Tenet and practice of separation of these Authors I might transcribe the most part of all his writings against the Donatists. Therefore I refer the Reader to the writings themselves, and beseeches these our Brethren yet in the fear of God and in humility of Spirit to consider and ponder their way they have run into was condemned, and solidly refuted from the Word of God, in these ancient *Schismatics*, by the Godly and Orthodox ancient Doctors of the Church in that time. And now I go on to Mr. *Lecky's* *Appendix*.

PART.

PART II.

Wherein is EXAMINED

M^r. LOCKIERS
TWO ASSERTIONS,

Concerning

CHURCH-GOVERNMENT:

And what is said for Confirmation thereof.

Have been, I confesse, well long upon the Examination of Mr. *Lockiers* Lecture, because I found not so clear and distinct handling of that matter in others, as I could have wished: and I thought it expedient that, in regard he speaks with so great a deal of confidence in it, and others made so much noise of it, and this new-fangle itching-ear'd age is ready to take with every new fancy, busked up with gay words, and, like children, to be carried about with every wind of doctrine; In this regard I thought it expedient the more fully to discover the weakness and unsatisfactoriness of his allegations therein. I shall not need, nor mind I to insist so largely upon the Appendix *. The matter therein touched, viz. What is the proper subject of Ecclesiastick Authority and Government: And whether there be an union of more Congregations and Churches under one common Presbytery: has been already so learnedly and fully cleared by others, that it were but needlesse labour for me to insist on it; And I confesse, I mervail much that Mr. *Lockier* should have presented the world with so sory a discourse upon these matters (as I think every

* I mean as to every particular Question handled here; For here are more particular questions handled.

judicious Reader will perceive this Appendix to be) when as there are abroad so learned Tracts and Debates on them. Always we must be at the pains to animadvert upon this part of the Stone too, else the world should be made believe we were fell'd dead with it: But we shall do it as briefly, as to particulars, as we may, and shall refer Mr. Lockier to such Pieces as are written already, for further businesse and work to him, as occasion shall require.

Mr. Lockiers APPENDIX

SECTION I.

6.2. **H**is first Assertion is this. *That the Eldership which is within the particular Congregation, is not in most weighty things, to exert power, without the consent and approbation of the Church whereof they are. By things most weighty, I mean these things. Which are most essentiall to the state of a visible Church: as admission of Members, ordination of Officers, and excommunication of either.*

5.3. 'Tis worthy Observation how the Author manages this mater of his first Assertion, the point he propounds to be proven, is that the Eldership of a Congregation may not, in most weighty maters, exert power without the consent and approbation of the Church, and for proof of this, his first Argument, SECT. 2. is an allegiance, that the power of the Keyes was primarily given to the Church of believers, as the Subject thereof, *Math. 16.16.* which allegiance he is pleased to passe with a very light and slight shew of a proof, as if it were a mater of small Debate. Whether thus he has done from deliberate and advised policy, to shun Debate upon that which is the very *τὸ ἀπολογεῖσθαι*, in this Question about Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction, and to make his common Readers the more favourable to his part, as pretending only to dispute for interest of consent and approbation to them in acts of Jurisdiction Ecclesiastick of greatest concernment. (and indeed as mans pride naturally carries him with a desire to have a finger in rule, so it is a plausible subject to speak for it to him) or if he has done it from some other principle,

principle, I will not determine; Let the judicious Reader conjecture, what he thinks most likely. Only I must say it seemeth to me a very strange and irrationall way of procedure, to take so great pains and make so much adoe, as Mr. *Lockier* doth here in pleading for a certain condition of persons formall interest and concurrence, in acts and the exercise of jurisdiction, and to make this the Question or conclusion to be insisted on: And mean while, to take it almost for granted without proof, or at most, in a slight overly word to alledge, that they are chiefly invell'd with that power and authority from which these acts must flow, when as he knoweth, at least might have known that his adversaries, not only deny, but by many considerable Arguments goes about to demonstrate, that that condition of persons never were invell'd with, never received such a power or authority, from him to whom it belongeth originally. Mr. *Lockier* does just here, as if a Papist or Jesuite, going about to Dispute the Controversie concerning the Popes supremacy, should be taken up all along the Dispute in bringing some topical Arguments, that this and that and the other act of supremacy, is calling of oecumenicall Councils, to be presiding in them, finall and infallible determining of controversies in Religio, &c. ought to be performed by the Pope of *Rome*; And mean while should misken the Question, if ever Christ gave him a grant of power and authority to perform these things, but only suppose it be so, or content himself to cite for it as it were *in tranfitu*, *Tibi dabo claves* or *Pasce oves meas*, as if it were out of question clear that these places held forth a soveraigne power and authority over all things, and persons Ecclesiastick in *Peter*, yea and in every Pope of *Rome*, bestowed on them by Christ. I think a judicious adversary might well laugh at a Papists disputing after such a manner. And so may any judicious man at Mr. *Lockiers* manner and method of disputing here, contending much in some topical Arguments to prove that the people ought to have an hand in such and such acts of Government, and mean while slight proving that they have the power and authority to govern granted them by Christ. I think a rationall disputant would have laboured first and mainly about this; And indeed were this made once clear, we should soon be at an agreement about the acts and exercises of government, once prove the forme or

habit to be in such a subject, and there will be no question about the acts thereof, whether they be competent to that subject or not. If any man shall say for him here, that by showing such and such acts to be competent to the people, it is proven consequently *a posteriori*, that the habit or power from which these acts do flow is in them: I answer, if that had been his intention so he might have done: But then he should not alledged the inexistency of the power, as a *medium* to prove that these acts are competent to them (as he doth in his 1. Arg.) for this is nothing else but to run in a round: but we must apply our selves to follow his method.

5.4. To speak a word then to the first Assertion, I will not question the *an sit*, or being of the Subject of this Assertion. Whether there be *de jure* and of Divine institution, an *Eldership*, or Presbyterie within a particular Congregation, *i. e.* a Colledge of Elders belonging to one single Congregation by it self having power of Government and exercising Ecclesiastick Discipline; although I know men Learned and much exercised in the study of the Questions concerning Ecclesiastick Government, are of the judgement, that there is not such an Eldership or Presbyterie; And I confesse 'tis right hard to finde in Scripture either precept or example for it: But I shall, going along with Mr. *Lockier* in the acknowledgment thereof, note but some few things upon the attribute of his Assertion: There be three things therein contained. 1. the acting spoken of, *viz.* exercising of power. 2. the object of that acting, most weighty things. 3. The limitation of that acting about this object, as competent to the Eldership.

5.5. For the first, Mr. *Lockier* speaketh so here as he would seem to grant to the Eldership some power and exercising of it about these weighty matters, providing it be with consent and approbation of the Church, *i. e.* the society of Professours they are in. But verily by his way the Eldership as contradistinguished from other professours, and as the Eldership has no power, nor can exert any power at all; I mean power of authority in these matters: All their part is meerly to preside and moderate the meeting of the Church, and as a Moderator, or Chair-man, to propone and state a Question; Ask and gather the votes, and declare the sentence concluded.

concluded by the votes of the collective body of the Church; convene and dismisſe the meeting; Or at moſt as a Committee of a Judicatory, to prepare maters for publick cognition and ſentence: All which is no Authoritative power. I think therefore that Mr. Lockier would have dealt more candidly to have plainly ſaid, the Eldership can exert no power at all in theſe maters; This belongs to the collective body of the Church, and their part is only to preſide and moderat the meeting in exerting its power: But ſuch plain language, which yet ſpeaks the truth of his way, is too plainly diſſonant to the language of Scripture, which ſpeaketh of Church Officers, as Governours of, and to be over the people, and having the rule over them, and many ſuch other things attributeth unto them, which importeth another kind of thing then meer preſiding, moderating, or being the mouth of a meeting or a preparatory Committee.

For the ſecond, why does Mr. Lockier here reſtrict his aſſertion, to *theſe maters of greater weight*? Does he grant that yet they may exert power in maters of leſſe weight without the conſent and approbation of the Church? Nay, he cannot. For, 1. moſt of his Arguments following, if they prove ought to his purpoſe; they prove the Eldership cannot exert power in any maters of Eccleſiaſtick Government without the conſent of the Church, whether of greater or ſmaller weight. Yea, 2. in his laſt Argument to prove they cannot exert power in theſe greater maters, he aſſumeth that they may not do it in ſmaller maters. For (ſaith he; Sect. 11. Pag. 81.) *if in leſſe things the Eldership may not act alone, ſurely not in greater.* What then needed this reſtriction of the object in the Aſſertion?

But now what are theſe maters moſt weighty? He tell us, *theſe things which are moſt eſſentiall to the ſtate of the Viſible Church*; And then reckons up particularly theſe three *admiſſion of Members, ordination of Officers, and Excommunication of either.* To paſſe that expreſſion of moſt eſſentiall importing degrees in eſſentiality which Philoſophy will not admit, as telling us that *eſſentia rei non recipit magis & minus.* I do humbly conceive that the ſix Preaching of the Word of God, and right adminiſtration of Sacraments are as eſſentiall (to uſe his words) to the ſtate of the Viſible

S. 6.

S. 7.

Visible Church as any of these particulars mentioned. Nay they are much more essentiall; there may be a true Visible Church, where these are, tho Excommunication be wanting, and that admission of members Mr. *Lockier* speaks of, unknown to the Primitive Apostolick times. It has been the constant Doctrine of Reformed Divines, that the sound Preaching of the Word and right Administration of Sacraments, are necessary to the being of a Church, and exercise of Discipline only to the *well-being*. Some Churches have no Excommunication, which though we approve not in this; yet because they have the true Doctrine of the Gospel taught and professed in them, and the Sacraments therewith administrat right for their substance, God forbid we should account defective of the most essentialls. (to speak so with him) of a true Church. Now if the Preaching of the Word be a thing most essentiall to the state of a Church, as certainly it is, must the Ministers of Christ, not Preach any Doctrine, as the Doctrine of Christ, without the consent of the Church, *i. e.* of the professors to whom they Preach? Must it be first propounded to them to have their vote and sentence passe upon it, and upon that Preached? I conceive Mr. *Lockier* will not own such theologie. 2. That admission of members which he meaneth here, is so far from being one of these things most essentiall to the state of a Visible Church, that, as he and others of his mind conceive it, 'tis but a meer new device, unknown in the preceeding ages of the Church, and without ground in the Word of God: He means admission into the fellowship of this or that particular Church or Congregation by a Church Covenant as they call it, which he conceives to be that which formally gives Visible-Church-Membership, and that it must be upon such qualification as he has been disputing for in his Lecture. But as there is no warrand in the Word of God for such qualification as necessary to Visible-Church-Membership (as has been cleared in our former part) so it is a plain mistake that admission unto the fellowship of this or that particular Church, is that which formally makes one a Visible Church Member; And that it is founded upon another mistake, which is a *misapprehension* in the Church way of the Independent Brethren, *viz.* that there is no Visible Church Catholick or Universall; but that a particular Congregation

gregation is the only Church. The truth is, profession of the true Faith, and of subjection to Ordinances, with the seal of baptism compleatly makes a man a Member of the Visible Church, (else, such were *in vacuo*, without, and so but of the world of heathens and strangers, which is absurd) and admission in this or that particular Congregation, gives him only the opportunity of exercise of his Church-membership and the priviledges thereof (whereunto he had right before) *hic & nunc*, all which has been so cleary evinced by judicious and learned Mr. *Hudson*, in his *Vindication of the Essence and Unity*, &c. that any man that will not wilfully shut his eyes against the light, may be fully convinced thereof. So then as for admission of Persons into this or that particular Congregation, it is not a mater of so high essentiality to the state of the Visible Church. And for that wherein solemn admission into the state of the Visible Church formally consists, *baptizing*, if Mr. *Lockier* shall say that this cannot be done without the sentence of the collective body of Professours, he'll speak beside the book of God, which holds forth to us baptism administered by one Minister alone without the knowledge of any particular Church: and mentioneth not any instance, so far as I can remember of Ministers requiring the vote of the Church for baptizing any at any time.

For the third, the limitation of the Elderships exerting of power, *not without the consent and approbation of the Church*. Upon this. 1. I would inquire of Mr. *Lockier*, whom he meaneth by the Church, without whose consent and approbation, this ought not to be done? Whether the whole Congregation, *i. e.* all Members thereof promiscuously and indifferently, or only some certain Members thereof excluding the rest? If the whole Congregation and all the Members thereof; Then women and children also must have an hand in these weighty maters of the Government of the Church: which I cannot well think he will affirm; sure I am, will not be owned by many of his side, and is contrary to the Word of God. If not the whole Congregation, but some certain Members *viz.* men & these of years of discretion, or of a manly age; Then 1. why speaketh he of the Church indefinitely without any such restriction *not without the consent and approbation of the Church*.

S. 3.

Church. Are not women a part of the Church, yea and children also under age, unlesse we shall say that they are without, i. e. of the world of heathens and aliens from the Israel and Household of God, which is absurd. Nay I suppose there may be a Church consisting of only women beside the Officers, as in case all the men of a Congregation were removed by death or otherwise, for must we say that a Congregation consisting of 40. men and as many women, if by Pestilence all the men should be removed; excepting the Officers thereof, that it should, because of this, cease to be a Visible Church. 2. It cannot consist with what he saith afterward in sundry of his Arguments brought to prove his Assertion: In the first thereof he alledgeth that the power of the Keyes are given to persons not as Officers, Apostles, or Elders, *but as beleevers, so the Church of beleevers, and beleeving with such a faith as flesh and blood cannot reveal.* but I assume that Women are beleevers, and beleevers with such a faith as well as Men. *Ergo*, by his Argument they must have an hand in the Government by their consent and approbation as well as the men. Again in the third, whereas he alledges, *that other wayes (viz. than as he asserted) the Elders cannot but defend the little ones of the Church, yea the tender consciences of stronger Brethren, for as much as persons may be taken in and casten out concerning which they can have no distinct knowledge.* I assume, that this will hold as well for women, little ones of the Church and sisters of tender consciences, as well as men; Because offending of these must be eschewed as well as of those. Further in his fourth Argument, he alledgeth as a ground of his Assert. *that the spirit of discerning is not confined to Elders, but may be in great measure in some of the members, and a greater gift when all are joyned together in the Name of Christ, and his presence with them to discern and judge.* And addeth, *that the Saints shall judge the World:* All which take in female Saints as well as male Saints.

§. 9.

2. When as there is a consent and approbation of acts of Government, *privat, obedientiall, and not-authoritative.* And a consent and approbation *publick and authoritative by way of a judicall decisive vote;* Why is it that the Author does not in his Assertion

Assertion determine which of these he means? 'Tis true afterward in his 5th Argument he is expresse, that the whole Church (and so men, women and children) should be joyntly *authoritative* about these acts of Government: But here in propounding the Assertion involves the mater in an ambiguous generality. It would seem, to bear the ignorant Reader in hand that we did grant nothing to people about these acts of Government, but a passive blind obedience to what is determined by the Eldership: It would seem I say, this is the drift of it, the rather that afterward, SECT. 5. end. he hints at our Doctrine in this expression. *If the managing of all things be committed wholly to the Presbytery, and the people left out, only to see and judge implicitly by their eyes and wills who thus impropriat power.* But surely this is either a grosse misunderstanding or a foul misrepresentation of the Doctrine of Presbyterians in this mater, which may appeare by these things which they teach and grant unto the people, in relation to matters belonging to Ecclesiastick Government. As

§. 10.

First we grant, as to the mater of the Calling of Ministers and Officers of the Church, that to all the people belongeth the power to nominat and elect the persons to be their own Church-Officers: And that to put upon a people, who are Christians and in a capacity to elect, any Church Officer, without their consent and election, is unwarrantable intrusion. But withall we affirm that this nomination or election, is not an authoritative act of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction, conferring upon the person any Ministeriall or Officiall power and authority, but that this is conferred by the act of ordination (the ordinary course appointed by Christ in his Church) Ministerially under Christ, and by vertue of his institution, which act is to be performed by the Rulers of the Church, and not by the people, and that the nomination or election performed by the people is only the designation of the persons on whom this power is to be conferred by ordination (if he be one as yet not ordained) and is appropriated to be their Minister. Besides we grant that any of the people has power to object any just exceptions against a person who is calling to be their Minister and they ought to be heard, and if their reasons be relevant they ought to be admitted.

EE

Secondly,

Secondly, we grant in like manner, as to admission of members, that any of the members of the Church has power to represent any just exception and reason they know against any person to be admitted, and that their reasons ought to be heard, and, if relevant, to be admitted.

S. 12.

Thirdly, as to the Preaching of the Word, we grant that the people are not obliged to give blind and implicit obedience to what is delivered by the Ministers, as if they ought to receive, as the Word of God, whatsoever is delivered by them, but that they have power, and ought by the judgement of discretion, to search the Scriptures, whether the things delivered by the Ministers be so, to try the spirits whether they be of God or not, to prove all things and hold fast that which is good, *Acts* 17. 11. *1 John* 4. 1. *1 Thess.* 5. 18. and the like judgement of discretion, we grant to, them in relation to other parts of worship.

S. 13.

Fourthly, as to the exercise of Ecclesiastick Discipline and the censure of offenders, and particularly Excommunication. We grant, 1. that privat professors are by the Word of God to exhort and reprove offending Brethren, yea and to admonish their Governours if negligent and remisse, *Coloss.* 4. 17. but this we say is an act nor of authority and jurisdiction, but of charity. 2. They are to complain to the Church of such as are obstinate in their offences against their privat reproof and admonition; but neither is this an act of authority and jurisdiction formally, but only preparatory thereunto, it is not *gradus in re*, but *gradus ad rem* of authorative Ecclesiastick Discipline. 3. When a person is sentenced by the Presbytery unto Ecclesiastick censure, For example Excommunication, they are to obey that sentence, and by avoyding the person as a Publican and heathen, put it in execution, not in an implicit and blind, but rationally obedience, and assent, for they must do it. 1. Out of clear knowledge of faith in themselves of the justice of the sentence, *in materia juris*, that the offence for which the censure is inflicted is by Gods appointment in his Word so censurable. 2. That the person is guilty of the fact for which he is censured: so that if the person do not acknowledge and take with it by confession, the manner and means of probation of it, ought to be signified to them, in the generall

at least. And if they can alledge any just reason against the justice of the sentence, either as to the point of law, or to the matter of fact they ought to be heard and admitted. Nor do we deny but that privat professors, being desirous upon just grounds, and for their clearing in giving obedience in such matters, may and ought to be admitted to hear and be witnesses of the leading and deducing of such processes. By all these it may evidently appear, how injurious an insinuation that is of the Author, wherewith he asperseth Presbyterians, that, to wit, by their way, the managing of all things in the Church is so committed wholly to the Presbytery that the people are left out only to see and judge implicitly by their eyes and wills appropriating this power to themselves. This way of managing the Government of Christs Church and binding people to implicit and blinde obedience, we abhorre as Antichristian usurpation and tyranny. And the Author in aspersing us with it, has dealt either uningenuously or ignorantly.

The thing we say is this, that in these things of Government admission of Members, ordination of Officers, exercise of Discipline, authoritatively to act, vote and judge, as Judges authorized with Christs Authority, belongeth not to privat persons, or the body of professors joyntly with the Eldership (which is the the thing Mr. Lockier plainly asserteth afterward, SECT. 6. *infra*. but involveth in a mist, in propounding his assertion at first, for what end he knoweth best himself) but only to Christs Officers, the Rulers set over his Church. Thus having cleared up the meaning of the Question we have in hand with the Author here, come we now to consider his Arguments for his Assertion.

SECTION II.

Examination of Mr. Lockiers 1, 2, 3, 4.

Argument.

First (saith he) *because the power of the Keyes was not at first given to Peter, or an Apostle, or an Elder, but as an Be-* SECT. I.

trier. The consequent he would infer must be this, Ergo, that

Ee 2

the

the Elders must not in these weighty matters of Government, admission of Members, ordination of Ministers, censures, &c. exert power without the authoritative joynr acting and concurring of the Church, i. e. the body of professors therein, with them. *Ans.* 1. If this consequence be good, then it must follow as well that Ministers cannot exert power of authoritative Preaching the Gospel but with the joynr authoritative concurrence of the people in Preaching with them. For certain it is that the power of Preaching the Gospel is comprehended in these Keyes given to *Petr*, as well as the power of censures, &c. and therefore if it follow, the power of the keyes was not given to *Petr* as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer: *Ergo* the Elders cannot exert power in ordination, censures, &c. without the joynr authoritative concurrence of the body of Professours therein, it must follow also: *Ergo* they cannot exert power in preaching the Gospel without their joynr authoritative concurrence therein: and so when the Minister preaches, all the people must authoritatively preach with him, else his preaching is null. 2. But waving this, and granting it were true that the power of the keyes was first given to believers, and so to *Petr*, not as a Minister, but as representing Believers. I do not see how it must of necessity follow that the body of Professours must act authoritatively, jointly with the Rulers in the exerting of that power. For we may suppose it was given to the body of the Church, not formally, but radically and virtually to be by them derived to Rulers to be formally exerted by these only, and then the consequent will not follow; as, suppose it were true, which many Politicians, and with them some Divines, maintain (which yet for my self I cannot see solide proof of) that the power of Civile Government is first given of God by a naturall right unto the body of people: yet from this it followeth not, that no Magistrates elected by people must exert power of Government without the joynr authoritative concurrence of the people with them. Then when ever a King is to exert an act of Government, or a Parliament, they must do nothing, unlesse the people sit down upon the Throne or in the house with them, and thus no doubt sundry Divines in former times, when they say that the power of the Keyes were given first to the whole Church of believers, are to be understood to have meant

meant, that this power was given to them not to be formally inherent and abiding in themselves, to be exerted and exercised by them: But virtually, by them to be setled upon such persons as they should deligne for Ministeriall offices in the Church, by whom only it is to be formally exerted and exercised, which yet is a mistake.

But let's see how the Author proves his antecedent, viz. *That the power of the Keyes was not first given to Peter, as an Apostle, or as an Elder, but as a Believer.* Only by the way, first, tis worthy observation that these of the Independent way, are not in agreement among themselves, yea nor some of them with themselves, touching this matter of the first subject to which the power of the Keyes was given, as we see marked in their own expressions by the learned Mr. *Candrey*, in his scheme of contradictions and contrarieties in the Independent way subjoyned to his *vindicatio vindictarum*. I shall here note some few of them to this purpose for the Reader, who may be, has not the book at hand.

S. 1.

1. The keyes were given to Peter as an Apostle, as an Elder, and as a Believer: So the sense is most fit: the Keyes, pag. 4.

The power of the keyes given to Peter, not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a professed believer. The way, Peter received not the Keyes meerly as a Believer, but as a Believer publicly professing his faith. The way cleared, P. 1. fol. 39. It appears that

A particular Church of Saints, professing the faith (i. members with- out Officers) is the first subject of all the Church Offices, with all their spiritual gifts and power: The keyes, pag. 51.

9. As the keyes of the Kingdom of heaven be diverse, so are the subjects to whom they are committed diverse. The Keyes, pag. 11.

So Lockier here

A Synod is the first subject of that power whereby error is convinced and condemned; ibid. pag. 47.

Not believers as believers, but believers Covenanting and fully capable according to Christs appointment, Hook. Surv. P. 1. p. 103.

9. The power of the Keyes belongs first to a Congregation of Covenanting believers, Hook. Surv. Part. 1. pag. 219.

The power of the Keyes is in the Church of Believers as the first subject, ibid p. 195.

That conceit is wide to make one first subject of this

<i>Christ gave the Keyes to the frater- nity, with the Presbytery, ibid. and the way clea- red, Part. 2. pag. 22.</i>	<i>but that he addeth not professed The Apostles were the first sub- jects of Apostolical power, ibid. 32.</i>	<i>this power and yet others to share in this power not by means of that, for this is to speak daggers and contradictions, ibid.</i>
---	--	--

5.3. Now see the Authors argument, upon the confession of his faith, had he this trust bequeathed to him, Mat. 16. 16. Therefore to the Church of Believers, and believing with such a faith as flesh and blood cannot reveal, was the Keyes of power primarily given, and to the Elders in the second place, as exerted out of this first estate, and as Officers and Servants of it. *Answ.* And first note some-what upon the consequent.

5.4. 1. The consequent as here inferred is much different from that which is propounded in the beginning of the paragraph, there it was propounded thus, the power of the Keyes was not first given to Peter as, &c. but as a beleever, here it is the Keyes of power, the former expression, (supposing there were such a distinction of Keyes, as Keyes of power, and another sort of Keyes different from these) being indefinite, may import both, but the latter importeth a specification of a definite sort of Keyes. What means this variation? That the Reader may understand this mystery the better, 'tis to be observed, that when as hitherto in the Church of God, by the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, being understood the Ordinances of Jesus Christ which he hath appointed to be administrate in his Church, or the power of administering these Ordinances under himself, these Keyes have been distributed unto the Key of Knowledge, or Doctrine, which is the preaching of the Gospel, taking in therewith the Sacraments as the Appendicles and seals of the Gospel, and the Key of Jurisdiction, or Discipline, which consists in Censures and absolution from Censures: Independents of late have forged new sorts of the Keyes, whereby they have confounded themselves, and would confound the whole Church of Christ in the mater of its Government. They tell us there is 1. a Key of Knowledge or Faith, the first subject whereof is every Believer, whether joined to a particular Congregation, or not. 2. A Key

Key of interest, power or liberty, which is in all the Brethren of a particular Congregation. And 3. a Key of Rule and Authority, which they say is in the Elders of a particular Church or Congregation. The meaning and refutation of these new forged Keyes see in *Jus Divin.* of Church Govern. part. 2. c. 10. pag. 108, 109, &c. and *Mr. Caudreys Vindicia* clau. c. 2. per tot. Now when Mr. Lockier in the consequent of his Argument speaks of the Keyes of power, it would seem he must understand that second kinde of Keyes. For I know no other going under that name amongst Independents. Yet may be, by a new conception of his own, he means that all power of government distinguished from the Preaching of the Word and Administration of Sacraments, exercised in ordination of Ministers, and dispensation of censures. Again see another great variation. At first he propounds that the Keyes were given to Peter first as a beleever. This may import (and as spoken there by the Author without any explication, cannot be otherwise understood but that it doth import) that they were given to him as a single beleever; but now in the consequent inferred in the pretended proof, he sayeth thus, they were given first to the Church of beleevers; this is a society of persons collectively and unitedly taken, and not persons singly. 2. Where shall we ever read, the Elders or Ministers called the Officers and Servants of the Church, that is; (as Mr. Lockier meaneth) by way of relation to the Church as a Superiour, or Mistresse, deputing and employing them to officiat and act in her place? We find indeed they are called the servants of the Church of beleevers by way of relation of a means to an end, for their good, 2 Cor. 4. 5. 1 Cor. 3. 22; as Angels or Ministring Spirits sent forth to Minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation, Heb. 1. ult. But they are only Christs Officers and Servants, by way of relation of Deputs to officiar, and employed to serve unto a Superior and Master deputing to officiat, and employing to serve in his place, and are set over the Church by him.

But now consider we how this consequent is proven. The Argument as propounded by the Author is Enthymemartick, and must suppose another premisse beside that which is expressed, which must be true as well as that expressed, to make the consequent good.

§ 5.

good. Now I humbly desire him to give us that suppressed and supposed premise. Verily, keep him to one syllogisme, and it is impossible to do it, observing the rules of good Logick and reason. But it may be done; may be, by two processes; Well then, they must be these for ought that I can conceive, (if he can do it otherwise and better, let him do it, and we shall consider of it) the first is this, that which was given to *Peter* upon the confession of his faith, was given to him as a Believer: But the Power of the Keyes were given to *Peter* upon the confession of his faith *Ergo* &c. then taking this conclusion for a ground of the second it must be thus That which was given to *Peter* as a Believer, was given to the Church believing with such a faith as *Peter* believed. But to *Peter* as a Believer was the Keyes of Power given *Ergo*, &c. It might be noted upon the major or first proposition of this latter syllogisme, that which was given to *Peter* as a Believer was given to the Church as believing with such a faith, as he believed with; That if in the attribute thereof, the Church be understood *collectively*, for the society of such Believers, as united and associated; and withall when it is said, that what was given to *Peter* as a Believer was given to the Church (thus taken *collectively*) believing with such faith, the meaning be, that it was given only to the Church considered, *viz.* *collectively*: then the connexion is not necessary (and so it is false, because it is materially and indeed an hypothetick proposition, and in an hypothetick proposition, if the connexion be not necessary, the proposition is false, as Logicians know) for that which was given to *Peter* as a believer, might be given to the Church as believing distributively; *i. e.* to every one of the Church believing, singly. If it shall be said, that that proposition may be mended thus that which was given to *Peter* as a Believer not singly considered; But as associated with others, that was given to the Church, &c. 1. That qualification is not once mentioned by the Author, nor hinted. 2. Seeing this qualification must be again taken in also in the assumption, thus the Keyes of Power was given to *Peter* as a Believer, not singly but as associate, then I say, suppose we should grant that in the Text now under our hand, *Matth.* 16. 16. the meaning were that the Power was given to *Peter* as a Believer: Yet, what could the Author bring from that Text to shew

shew that it was given to him as a beleever, not singly; but as qualified with this consideration, as associat with other beleevers? There is not the least hint for this in the Text: But somewhat to the contrair. See *Candrey Review* of Mr. *Hodgins Survey*, cap. 11. p. 172.

But the weight of all this proof brought by our Author here, hangs upon the major or first proposition of the former syllogisme, viz. what power was given to *Peter* upon the confession of his faith, was given to him as a beleever, i. e. considered under this formality, to be a power competent to him, simply as he was a beleeving person. The weight of all the proof, I say, hangs so upon this, that unless it stand good and be necessary, all falls to the ground; and indeed it is but a groundlesse supposition, of no necessity; and may be as easily denied, as it is supposed. Why? Might it not be, that Christ did upon *Peters* making so eminent a confession of faith give unto him a power, competent to him not simply, as beleeving with such a faith, and so not common to all beleeving with such a faith: But official competent to him as in such a particular office amongst beleevers, or constituting him formally, such an Officer? What evidence or necessity of reason can be brought to the contrair of this? I think Mr. *Lockier* did wisely, to suppress and suppose this basis of his proof, then to have expressed it, because the expression of it would too evidently discovered the weakness of his proof of his main point, that the *Keyes* of power, or power of the *Keyes*, was first given to beleevers, and not to the Officers in the Church. And now I must professe, I wonder much, that (after so many learned men have debated so much on that Text and brought so many considerable Arguments to prove that it cannot be meant in that place, that the power of the *Keyes* was given to *Peter* simply as a beleever, or to the Church of beleevers; And given so considerable answers to all Arguments brought by others to the contrair, a man of reputation as *Lockier*, should come forth with this poor one, that power was given to *Peter*, upon confession of his faith. Ergo, it was given to him as a beleever, or under that reduplication; and if this were enough to dash all, and in reason to convince all gain-sayers. The Lord pity them that are tamed about with such a wind of Doctrine.

Crime. I think it not needfull here to waste time and Paper in bringing Arguments to prove that, the power of the Keyes was given to Peter not as a beleever, nor to the community of beleivers; but as a Minister and Officer in the Church, there is abundance said to this purpose already by learned men, to whom I refer the Reader: namely, *Jus Divin.* of Church-Government, Part. 2. C. 10. pag. 93. & seq. Mr. Rutherford peaceable plea C. 6. pag. 63. Due right. C. 1. pag. 8. &c. C. 8. pag. 179. &c. *Candrey vindic. vindictar.* Cap. 1. Sect. 1. and Review of Hookers Surv. c. 11. Baily *dismissive from the errors of the time*, c. 9. What is brought against any of these upon the point by Hooker in his Survey, I doubt not but will be sufficiently examined by another more able then I. If Mr. Locking will be at the pains to represent any thing upon their Arguments, we shall be ready, with the LONDONs assistance, to take it to consideration.

S. 7.

To that which the Author citeth from *Gerfon*, *Claves data sunt Ecclesie, ut in actu primo*; & *Petro, ut in actu secundo*. I could have wished that the Author had pointed us to the place where we might have found it, and considered antecedents and consequents. I confesse I have not so much leisure as to read over every mans writs to find out every passage that may be cited out of them at randome. Yet for Answer, this of *Gerfon*, makes nothing for the Authors purpose. For, 1. By the name of the Church, *Gerfon* understands the Church Universall; as is clear to any that knows any thing of his and the *Parisian* Doctrine of his time. Our Author means a particular Congregation, to which the Independent way asserts, the fulnesse of the power of the Keyes to have been given, of such a subject recipient of the power of the Keyes, *Gerfon* never dreamed. 2. *Gerfons* mind was not, for ought can be perceived in his writs, that the power of the Keyes was given first to the Church, as distinguished from the Rulers and Officers, as the subject in whom it is formally inherent and so to be acted formally thereby: But to the Church as convened and represented in a generall Counsell, in the Church Synodically convened. *Potestas Ecclesiastica jurisdictionis, & sit Ecclesia data, Concilium generale representans Ecclesiam, habet illam; imo videtur quod Ecclesia sparsim considerata, non habet illam potestatem*

potestatem, nisi in quodam materiali seu potenciali, sed Congregatio & unio qua fit in Concilio generali dat ei formam. De potest. Eccles. Consid. 4. Whence it is evident that in these words, *Claves datae sunt Ecclesiae, ut in actu primo, & Petro, ut in actu secundo,* Gerson is not to be conceived to speak of the Church denotating the body of beleivers only, as contradistinguished from all Officers and Ministers, and so is not speaking of *Peter* as comprehending or representing all Officers and Ministers, but of *Peter* under the imaginary notion of a Pope or Head of the Church, and as standing in contradistinction both to the body of beleivers and also to all Inferiour Officers and Ministers, even convened in a Councell, and so of the Church, as comprehending all Inferiour Officers and a generall Councell of them. And here, because some are ready for the Independent Tenent, concerning the first subject of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction, to alledge the judgment of the *Parisian* Theologs, at, and after the time of Councells of *Basil* and *Constance*, affirming the Church to be that first subject, it is to be observed carefully, besides that these Theologs, means not a particular Church, but the Universall Church; That the Question which they had in hand with their adversaries the Papaline flatterers, was not between beleivers as such, and all Officers and Ministers as such, but between the Universall Church as comprehending Inferiour Officers, and that as convened in a generall Councell, on the one part, and the Pope of *Rome* on the other: Whether the precdency of Ecclesiastick power and jurisdiction, was seated in the Pope, or in the Universall Church so considered as we have expressed? This was the state of the controversie, and that for which the *Parisian* Doctors stood, was the latter of these. This is clear to all that have read any of these Doctors Writings upon that matter: So that to alledge their Assertion concerning the first and supreme subject of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction, for the Independent Tenent in this Question, which is between a particular Church of beleivers on the one part, as contradistinguished from all Officers and Ministers, and Officers of the Church upon the other, is very impertinent.

His second Argument, SECT. 3. is thus, *Elders are set over the Church, by the voluntary choice of the Church, whereof they* S. 3.
are

are such Officers, who choose them to be their Ministers in the Lord, and may depose them again, if they prove unworthy of such a station. Therefore have they no absolute power over that Church, to which they are servants; but in the nature of guides, to direct them in the wayes of the Lord, and so long as they go right, to be honoured and followed; but if otherwise, to be admonished; and if impenitent, to be rejected, i.e. Excommunicated as they whose sins follow after to judgment. Now such judgment could not be exercised upon Elders, if such an exempted power be taken to themselves, without the Church, but might do what they please with the Church in which they are Servants, and the Church not able, at least not sufficiently able to do any thing to them; which is to make them Lords over Gods Heritage, 1 Pet. 5. 3. *Ans.* Here is much impertinency in the conclusion inferred, and in the antecedent bare Assertions, begged but not proven, and never will be: 1. The conclusion propounded in the Assertion was, that the Elders in a particular Church are not to exert power in most weighty matters, as admission of Members, ordination of Officers, Excommunication, without the consent and approbation of the Church, i.e. without the judicall concurrence, consent, and joynt authoritative vote of the members. Now that which is inferred as the conclusion here, that they have not an absolute power over the Church, an exempted power to do what they please with the Church, I appeal to all rationall men to give their judgement if this and that be all one. Why? May it not be that the Elders or Officers set over a particular Church may exert power in putting forth such acts of Government without the joynt authoritative consent and vote of the members of that Church, and yet notwithstanding, not have absolute power over that Church, an exempted power to do with the Church what they please? Yes verily: for notwithstanding that, they may in their exerting of power of these acts of Government. 1. Only act Ministerially and adstricted to a certain definite rule over which they have no power. And 2. if they in their exerting their power deviat from that rule and act contrary to the direction thereof, the members may have liberty, upon discerning, by the private judgement of discretion to refuse obedientiall consent to them. 3. And there may be an authoritative power over and

and above them to which they may be accountable, who may authoritatively correct and redresse their deviation, and to which the people may have recourse for that effect. And if so, then their exerting of power in the matters of Government tho without the joint judicall and authoritative consent and vote of the members therein, is not an absolute power, an exempted power to do with the Church what they please. And so indeed it is in our Doctrine. The power it allows to Elders and Officers to exert acts of Government, without joint judicall authoritative consent of the members, is a Ministeriall power adstricted to a certain and sovereign rule of Christs Laws set down in his Word: It allows to people a liberty, yea asserts it to be their duty, to prove in the judgement of privat discretion, if the Officers in their actings of Government deviat from, or crosse the rule, or not; And in case they do, not to give their obedientiall consent therunto: And that there is authoritative power above the Elders of a particular Congregation, &c. So that the Author deals not ingenuously enough, in insinuating such an aspersion upon our Doctrine, that by it is given to the Elders of a Church an absolute power over the Church, an exempted power to do with the Church what they please. But now judge if the Independent way (in that strain of it followed by our Author) be not guilty of giving a power very like this to members over Officers: When as it allows to the members, or the greater part of the members, of a particular Congregation (which may be 3. or 4.) to censure, depose, Excommunicat all their Officers (which must be 3. at least) by a supream Independent Authority, without any Superiour Authority on earth left to have recourse to for redresse, were their proceeding and sentence never so unjust, this I am sure is very absolute, exempted, and lordly-like indeed. Well then, correct the conclusion as it is inferred here, and reduce it to the more modest and ingenuous terms of the Assertion.

The antecedent or proof which the Author brings in this Argument for his Assertion (and is very confusedly set down) in effect is made up of these Assertions. 1. A Church by their voluntary choice, not only choise their Elders, But 2. makes i. c. ordains, them in their Office, 3. May depose them again, the Elders are

the Churches servants, by way, to wit, of relation to her as a Mistress. 4. The Elders are only guides to lead the Church, to wit, as a Chair-man or Moderator in a Judicatory, guides and leads the proceedings of the Judicatory. 5. The Church, if the Elders go wrong, may not only admonish them: But 6. if impenitent, reject, *i. e.* Excommunicate them. *Ans.* 1. If the Church, ordain their Elders, may depose them, may Excommunicate them: To speak of Elders exerting power but not without consent and approbation of the Church, is, give me leave to say it without offence, upon the matter a Gilli-maurey. The Church can, and does exert Power it self by it self without Elders exerting any Power, in these weighty matters of Government. And what need then to talk of a necessity of their consent and approbation to the Elders exerting the Power? nay by these suppositions, the Elders, as such, shall have no Power, no judicial or authoritative Power at all, to exert; As such they are at most only as Chair-men and Moderators to the Church in its exerting Power. But. 2. all these Assertions making up the Antecedent or proof, except the first concerning the electing of Officers (which is no act of Government, nor makes a man a Minister, but only is a designation of the person to be made a Minister by ordination, or an application of him being a Minister, to exercise his office in a particular charge) and the sub. concerning admonition (which is not an act of jurisdiction or authority, but a duty of love and mercy competent to every single Professour.) except these two, all the rest are but bare unwarranted Assertions, and a very begging of the things in question: More of them severally hereafter. Only in a word now here concerning the last, that the Church may Excommunicate their Elders, however many of the Independents, affirm so: Yet some of them, and these not of least account, have scunnered at it, yea denied it down-right, and given reason for their so denying. As Mr. Cotton, *Excommunication is one of the highest acts of rule, and therefore cannot be performed but by some rulers.* The Keyes, pag. 16. *The Church cannot Excommunicate the whole Presbytery, because they have not received from Christ an office of rule without their Officers, ib.* no act of the peoples power doth properly bind, unlesse the authority, of the Presbytery joine with it. 3. But one word more

for

for the present, when the Author says that the *Elders are set over the Church* and yet makes them but servants of the Church, in the sense we have before expressed, subject to judicall tryall and censures by the Church, &c. he gives us but an empty word, *nomen sine re*, which is another scorn, it is impossible by his way, to shew us one act of authority, in regard of which, they can be said to be over the Church. See this I say, made good impreguably by Reverend Mr. *Rutherford, due right of Presbyteries*, pag. 311. to 323.

This is to be looked after the retrogradation of the number of pages mentioned by the Printer in admonition about Errata. S. 10.

As to the Latine testimonie cited by the Author to confirm what he has been saying concerning the Church of believers power to censure their Elders and Officers, I professe I know not what Author he means, nor have leisure to enquire. But to the two Texts of Scripture pointed at in it: 1. The former Act 11. 3. 'tis true, *Peter* there giveth an account of his going in to the uncircumcised. But 1. was he required by a Church of Believers only and distinguished from all Elders and Officers (in which notion it is that Mr. *Lockier* is now speaking of the Church) to do this before them judicially? this is a dream: The Church at *Jerusalem*, before whom *Peter* was at that time, consisted of Elders as well as Believers. And the Apostles and Brethren that were in *Judea*, heard, &c. and it is well observed by the Nedder Dutch Notes, that under the name of *Brethren*, are comprehended the Elders, who afterwards, c. 15. 23. are distinguished from private brethren, 'tis said, v. 2. that some of the Brethren contended with him for that deed, now, supposing that they challenged him judicially, and that he made his Apology judicially, how shall it be evidenced from the Text that he did it, before the body of Professours, and not before the Colledge of Apostles and other Elders only, sitting and cognoscing judicially upon the matter? the sharpest sight in the World will not see a vestige of any thing of this kind in the Text; nor can any man shew us either precept or example in Scripture for a Church of Believers alone judicially cognoscing and giving sentence of censure upon their Elders and Rulers. 2. Suppose there had been none but private Believers amongst them to whom *Peter* made that Apologie to remove the scandall; Yet that were but a poor ground to prove, that he did it to them judicially sitting upon him,

him, and as having authority to judge and censure him, for why? One Christian doing any thing at which offence is taken, may and ought to give an account and satisfaction to another private brother who is offended, for removing the offence: Yet hath not a private brother authority or power, judicially to cognosce and passe sentence upon another brother.

S. 11.

2. To the other place, 1 Cor. 3. 22. brought for that, *Pastors* and so other Church Officers are the servants and Ministers of the Church. 1. 'Tis true the Pastours there are said to be the Churches, and so also are the world, life, death, things present, things to come, and all things. But I hope none will be so absurd as to say that the World, Life, Death, &c. are the Churches, as servants, in way of relation to the Church, as a Mistressse, calling, commissioning them under Her: they are the Churches as means to Her good, and so are the Pastors and Rulers Her servants in this sense. 2. The Independents will not stand to affirme that ordinary Officers are the servants of a particular Church as their Mistressse commissioning them and having Power over them. Yet I am ready to think their Remonstr will stand at it, to affirme so much of the Apostles of Jesus Christ as Apostles: And yet by that Text even the Apostles themselves as Apostles are held forth to be the Churches, as well as ordinary Pastors and Rulers, and that in a like manner for ought can be perceived by the Text.

S. 12.

The 3. Argument, *See Cor. 4. Because otherwise (if the Elders should exert power in these matters of Government without the joint Authoritative consent and vote of the members of the Church) the Elders cannot but offend the little ones of the Church, yea the tender consciences of stronger Brethren; But offence ought not to be given to Christ's little ones, one of the least of the family. Ergo, &c.* To prove the assumption needlesse pains is taken. Now if this Argument hold good, it will conclude; that not only men but women also, must have joint authoritative consent and vote with the Elders in these matters of power and Government: For he might as well in the proposition spoken, what he sayeth of Sisters, whether little ones or of stronger, but of tender consciences, as of Brethren: And it is no lesse lin to offend the one, then it is to offend the other. But now see we how the consequence of the proposition

Part II. (210)
 general concernment, which should be referred properly and determined to the Officers of the Church: Which had he done I doubt not, but we should have seen either matters of secret order, no ways importing any civil power or authority, or Church Officers have attempted to claim in the Westminster Assembly such as a Chair-man or Moderator of a Synod, or any other relation to its judicial proceedings, which they have had no authority over the Indicators: Of some of them to be such trials, some as sets of or great general concernment to the whole Church, as the *Hebrews* Part 2. c. 1. pag. 41. and the other things given to the Elders as properly belonging to them, as Matter of censure and Excommunication, the Examination of the state, and doctrinall propounding of the sentence, and that the Synod should not more power to oppose the sentence of the Synod, than they have, then they have to oppose their doctrine delivered in Preaching of the Gospel, and so that the one is as binding as the other. If there be not such things, more than merely doctrinall, or very great general concernment, I profess I know not what I say, I assume it, and it is evident that barely giving power is given to two or three Elders in a particular Congregation, whereas Presbyterians attribute it. I say now, as the matter of a particular Congregation, but to any Classickal Presbytery of many Congregations: For by the way of Presbyterians, when a Classickal Indictment has given forth sentence of Excommunication, there may be an appeal to a more ample and Superior Indictment for full recognition and redresse, and here by this Independent way, power is given to two or three Elders to propound the sentence of Excommunication, which the Synod are bound to obey, as much as to obey their Preaching, and there is no superiour remedy of judicial recognition and redresse left to the party under Heaven. 4. If any matters of general concernment wherein the benefit or hurt of every member is concerned, must be authoritatively transacted not by the Synod alone, but by the members jointly with them, I be not why all matters of general concernment ought not to be so also: *Ubi omnes sunt ibi omnia fiunt.* But to come to the point wherein I live in the point of that, that it is an offence given and not taken when the members are offended, because they

they cannot by judicial and authoritative vote hinder the sentence of the Eldership, the decisive sentence being only in the Elders. If because in these transactions the benefit or hurt of every member is generally not considered, therefore it is an offence given if they have not such a power of judicial concurrence and vote in the society. Thus they would almost have this power and if they offend in want of it, for they are already a sect, so offend if they have no power to prevent what the offence is given and maintained, though some of the members are comprehended under that very offence, and their benefit or hurt is concerned as well as mine. The Society will never be able to avoid this upon the ground. If because in these transactions the benefit or hurt of every Member of the Church is generally and equally considered, and therefore it is not an offence because they cannot by judicial and authoritative vote hinder the sentence, the decisive power of consent being only in the Elders, the offence is not taken but given, and therefore they ought to have full vote, then for I by a good conscience am not without, because in the great Council, our in civil Government, suppose a Major and his Council, by a Parliament, the sentence in law of every member of the City of Cambridge, and of the County and County concerned; If the Members offend that they cannot by joint authoritative vote hinder the sentence, the decisive power increasing the other in these transactions, the offence is not taken but given. And therefore they ought to exercise jointly and authoritatively in these transactions with their Government. Here is again Levelling, backed with reason, which is it. 7. Therefore to answer directly, 'tis but a foolish and false principle, that in all transactions in which the benefit or hurt of persons is concerned, all persons whose the hurt or benefit is therein concerned, if they offend that they have not sufficient ability to hinder sentence, by their joint authoritative vote, the offence is not taken but given, and therefore they ought to have such joint authoritative concurrence and vote. Nay it tends to the eversion of all Government and brings in meer Anarchy and confusion. Yet 8. I think from this rightly understood may be inferred somewhat which Mr. Locke would consider in the matter of his next Assertion. For if all whole benefit or hurt

be, have as great a measure of knowledge and understanding for teaching the Word as Ministers, & so worth proportionally upon that ground, that such men may and ought to Preach authoritatively, as well as Ministers, and so some some Remonstrants and Separatists teach. *But* it is needful, an outward calling to be a Minister: His gift is calling sufficient. To assume directly to reason from a gift of discerning is more coming under Arbitrary Government to assume only, and power to consent authoritatively to these Acts of Government, is to assume and usurp *(as a usurper)*. Let a man have but a measure of a gift, for exercising Acts of Government or public authority, he must besides have the warrant of Commission or calling to exert them, else if he take upon him to exert them, he is but an intruder, so all men will grant that, and so must both Scripture, light, and light of nature, and reasoning in Affaires Civil and Ecclesiastick imbrace this of necessity. Whereas the Authors, saying, *their will be a greater gift of discerning* (Officers and private professors) are joined together, *to execute these Acts of Government* in the name of Christ and his Church, *they think to discern and judge*. We grant, that when all these Professors with the Church Officers are joined together, possibly there may be a greater gift of discerning by way of aggregation then when the Officers are alone. But it is as withall it is tacitely supposed, that all may meet in the name of the Lord (i. e. in his Authority) and may the more expect his presence for assisting the discerning & judging in their matters of Government: in the former he begs the thing in question, we deny that they do all meet for acts of Government in Church Authority, and in the latter supposes a great mistake, for the promise of Christs assisting presence for individual and authoritative discerning and judging, runs not equally along with the gift of discerning simply. But with his calling and commission to govern. *That let I say with you to the end of the world*, as to Acts of Government, it is not made to persons having the gift of discerning, singly, tho never so many of them meet together: But to persons who beside their gift, are invested with his Commission. Therefore you must shew that persons have a Commission and Calling, beside their gift, to exert Acts of Ecclesiastick authoritative judging: Or to speak of expectation

tion of the Lords presence to their judging, let them be never so many, it is to him men presume to act with expectation of his assisting presence without a promise. There are reports of Christs presence expected to assist them having a Calling and Commission from him, in exercising Acts of Government: Then with a huge multitude though having none in such. Descenting Commission. It shall be said that private Brethren have a Commission to judge authoritatively with the Eldership in these matters of Ecclesiastical Government. That the wisdom of this Argument is manifest for it is manifest to men, that the gift of discerning, as necessary to such a Commission, is an arbitrary judgement. 1. That is far from what the promise shew in the authentic grant of that Commission. This much for the first part of the Argument in this Section, he adds another thus.

The Scripture again saith that various of gifts are given unto the Church, as Christ will, and when he will, and where he will, and by what door, and by what man hand he will, for the good of the whole, and so he comes in sundry ways, in sundry times, and places, when large numbers are close together, and the whole is less apparent, as the whole body of great weight are in motion. So that the greatest cannot see the way, they cannot see the way. All this only to the good of the whole, would he now, if the managing of all things be committed wholly to the Presbtery, and the people left out, to see and judge implicitly, by their eyes and ears, who have no special power. And 1. Here is a true misrepresentation of the Presbyterian Doctrine as it allowed nothing to the people but a Popish implicit blind obedience to the Elderships decrees. See this misrepresentation discovered and wiped away, before in our first Sect. I. and the Author in his own conscience knows, may know, this is a wrong. Further, when Christ has by his institution appointed a power to a certain order (and he has as to Pastors and Doctors) the ordinary public authoritative Preaching of the Word, & to Elders in common the power of Discipline) for these alone to exert such power is no impropriation. But 2. To the Argument propounded here, I say 1. If it hold good, as in the former, it will follow that women must not be excluded from joynt authoritative concurrence in exercising power of Government with

with the Elders more than men in the Church. Who, when
have their share of the gifts of the Spirit in the Church, and
some of them, in particular, are called to be more active
in by their gifts, and to be more active in the Church, and
help of their gifts, and to be more active in the Church, and
committed to the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
and they are not, and they are not, and they are not, and
may, by proportion, be more active in the Church, and
a common-welfare, and to be more active in the Church,
with them, with them, and to be more active in the Church,
and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
prophesied, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
the Church, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
Government, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
the people, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
the whole, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
upon the Church, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
void, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
the consequence, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
gifts given to the Church, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
good use, and to be more active in the Church, and to be more active in the Church,
not consume inordinately in doing or exercising acts of
Government of the Church. May not great members make their
share of gifts forth-coming and helpful for the good of the whole,
by observing, instructing, exhorting, encouraging, and providing
for good to one another, in the most judicious and all way as
charity? Ay, but it may be said the help of gifts given in them is
the good of the whole in the way of authoritative acts of Govern-
ment, made void. *Ans.* You suppose, that these gifts of
privat members, are given to them by charity, as is intended for the
good of the whole in the authoritative acts of Government, and
that the authoritative acts of Government, are appointed by
Christ to be managed and carried by the small influence and con-
currence of these gifts given to privat members. And this is to
suppose, and so, to beg the thing in Question. Yet further, we
say the gift that is in privat members, is forth-coming to the
good of the whole, which is to be effected by the acts of Govern-
ment.

[illegible][illegible]

...the ... should be ...
... of the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...

an answer to his argument, that for that which we have offered

At the 24th meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, held on 24th September 1938, the following resolution was adopted:

that Chubb's new design will be a significant improvement over the current design.

beat the ...

ry in the... in
meat...

meanwhile, the film

... ..

DATE: 10/10/2001

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 105–112

the number and type of people in the family. Children

TABLE 1. *Continued*

1990

1000

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

of indigenous and non-indigenous populations.

the people, not only in the U.S. but also

... ..

12-10-1944

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WE OPEN FOR YOU AND YOUR BUSINESS. WE OPEN FOR YOU AND YOUR BUSINESS.

who is not by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Churchman, which was not a bad thing.

any other Mr. or Mrs. [redacted]

brief word to each part of the song to them.

To the first, viz. that the ...

Affairs between men and women

these men he has not only had a good time, but he has

Received 10/2/03

... distinct from other small ...

...that to many of the Jews in the Jewish community...

© 1997 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This book is printed on acid-free paper.

...I was a little bit of a... I was a little bit of a... I was a little bit of a...



* See these
cited by
learned
Gillespy,
Barons
Red, book
1, 4, 5.

Part of the proof: Officers of the Court, to take for the

[The following text is extremely faded and illegible, appearing as a dense block of horizontal lines.]

§. 4.

[The following text is extremely faded and illegible, appearing as a dense block of horizontal lines.]

Gospel Church from the meaning of its
representation of Christ. For Christ
as is known to all. The Church is directed as to
relating to the Church of Christ. The Church
present being the Church of Christ. The Church
then by Christ. The Church is directed as to
I will not be a part of the Church of Christ.
As we have seen that the Church of Christ
does not Jewil. The Church of Christ
has in case of the Church of Christ. The Church
to the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
ed Church. The Church of Christ
ment of the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
or learn of the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
especially of the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
only speaks and the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
offend thee. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
of a Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
filing out. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
who are the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
nor a little to understand the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
the Jews. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
the Jews. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
might one have communion with the Church of Christ
with Publicans. But the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
I say not there are demonstrative grounds. The Church of Christ
lean that way. But see we what the Author brings. The Church of Christ
that the order of the Gospel Church. The Church of Christ
boundhood. The Church of Christ.

Hudson
words of
the Essence
and Unity
of the Church
of Christ
Page 3

S:7. The first Ground is the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
and the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
ber of the New Church. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
X. The true Church of Christ. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
in the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
is a great Church. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ
and the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ. The Church of Christ

“...and the people of the world are not yet aware of the danger that is threatening them.”

⁶² *divina accipere*. *ibid.*, 106.

S. 14. For the purpose of this section, the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other entity, whether or not it is a citizen of the United States, and whether or not it is a resident of the State of New York.

1940

1990

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

The first group of individuals who have
been sent to the Penitentiary are those
who are guilty of the crime of murder, the
robbery, and other crimes.

1. Getting that by the way

...the ground
in combination
here two ex-
...the
places
...der-
...the fac-
...the

[illegible]

1. *Dei Patris* (The Father) (John 1:1-18) - The Father is the source of all life and light. He is the one who created the world and all things in it. He is the one who sends the Son into the world to save it.

[illegible]

SECTION IV

Lockers - removed from room 4110
Sect 2 - 4110 removed

[illegible]

...the first time, this was a well known fact to frequent
that Bishop Whitgift himself, one who was
...our learning, nor any other here, and fearing to
...to maintain a false contrary to what we are upon, yet
...to confess that in the dispute, since the state of the
...democratical or popular, the people or multitude had
...in every thing, Defence, pag. 183. which words
...that I am upon. For instance, I have
...whole body had their joint voice
...proved. —

§ 3.

§ 4.

L61

big

S. I.

S. 2.

S. 3.

The gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands. It had been an Assembly of Apostles that had laid their hands on Timothy, and so joined with Paul in that action, Paul had not thus distinguished his laying on of hands from that of his fellow Apostles, as if the gifts of the Holy Ghost had been given to Timothy only, by the laying on of his hands, and not by, but with the laying on of the hands of his fellow Apostles. Of this difference of the Phrase in the one Text and the other, see this same worthy Author, pag. 101. 2. Apostles and Elders are ordinarily distinguishing names in Scripture, the latter signifying the ordinary, perpetual, fixed Rulers in the Church. So that it must be but a device and fiction, to leave the ordinary notion of the word Elder, which signifies an Office diverse from the Apostleship, and to take the Eldership here for an Assembly of Apostles. Nay we do not find any time in Scripture the name Elder given to the Apostles, at least never to them or any of them as Apostles contradistinguished from other Officers. 'Tis true *Peter*, 1 *Epist.* 5. 1. calls himself *Elder*; But from that very appellation, the worthy Author, we are now borrowing from, doth excellently reason, and for our purpose, against Mr. *Lockier* here, I need not transcribe his words, seeing the Book is common, the Reader may have recourse to it itself, and have much satisfaction. See pages 105, 106, 107. We conclude then and affirm that this Eldership was no other but an Assembly of Elders, as were these, *Acts* 20. 17. ordinary Elders of the Church; And to expound it of an Assembly of extraordinary Officers, is but a fiction without ground in Scripture, devised by men, to shut out clear light. And Mr. *Lockier* may remember that as able judicious men as are of his way, the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly at *Westminster*, in their Reasons against the Proposition of Ordination, take it to be an ordinary Eldership, and so reason from it to the regulating of ordinary Ordination of Elders in the Church. That a sufficient Presbytery (say they, meaning, as is evident, an ordinary Presbytery) may assume all and sole power of ordination, is proved, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

Mr. *Lockier's* Reason to prove the contrary is of no force. *Tim.* 4. 2. whereby was an extraordinary Officer, an Evangelist, and it is beyond

the power of ordinary Officers to give being to an extraordinary. That same worthy Author, we mentioned, sufficiently discovered the weaknesse of it in the place cited: pag. 103. For 1. If it should be said that *Timothy* was twice ordained: first to be a Presbyter, then to be an Evangelist, (as some Episcopall Writers say, to be a Bishop: but a Bishop distinct from a Presbyter is a humane creature not in Scripture) and the first to be that, mentioned *2 Tim. 4. 14.* done by the ordinary Eldership; The second mentioned *2 Tim. 1. 6.* done by *Paul* an Apostle, an extraordinary Officer above an Evangelist; I know not what *Mr. Lockier* will bring to infringe this. 2. Supposing that he was but once ordained, an Evangelist and Elder both (as who ever was an Evangelist was also an Elder) yet an ordinary Eldership might concur with *Paul* in his Ordination, and the act of these ordinary Elders extend no further but to that which was common to him with other Elders, the Office of Eldership, that which was extraordinary flowing from the Apostle *Paul's* concurrence in the businesse. In this mixt action we may very well distinguish, what was ordinary and what extraordinary, ascribing that to the Presbytery (*viz.* together with *Paul*) this to the Apostle. 3. Yet further I say with the worthy Author, I bring these things from, that I can see no inconsistency or absurdity, if it be said that the Presbytery sent forth and ordained *Timothy* as an Evangelist: that it is alledged an Evangelist is an extraordinary Officer, and therefore the Elders being ordinary Officers could not give him a being, *i. e.* ordain him, I deny the necessity of the consequence, any reason that can be brought to prove that consequence must be, as I conceive, one of those two, *viz.* Either; 1. That which is brought by some, from, *Hebrews 7. 7.* *The lesse is blessed by the greater*, to which, as to this particular in hand, that worthy Author has sufficiently answered, by two things First, that altho *Timothy* as an Evangelist was greater then a single Presbyter, yet that proves not that he was greater then the whole Presbytery, as one of the house of Lords is (sure was) greater then one of the house of Commons; Yet not then the whole house of Commons, altho That is that blest is not greater then he that is blessed, every way: But *quatalis*, in so far as he blest is, and so why might not the Presbytery

Presbytery be greater than an Evangelist, not simply and absolutely, but so far as they blessed and ordained him? That Author gives two instances of the like, *Act. 9. 17.* and *Act. 13. 1. 3.* Ors. the reason of that consequence must be this: Because, ordinary Officers not having in themselves that extraordinary office, can not give that which they have not. And if this be it, I would then aske Mr. Lockier, how can people give the Office of a Minister which they have not in themselves, nay, the Office of an Apostle, as he alledgeth that the people ordained *Matthias* an Apostle, whatsoever he can answer for that will serve our turn for the Presbytery, ordaining *Timothy* to that Office, which they had not in themselves. The truth is, mens ordaining a person to an Ecclesiastick Office, not being by way of proper efficiency, nor yet the Ordainers acting therein as principal agents or conferrers of the office (that is Gods part by his institution) but as morall instruments under God. It is not, *ex natura rei*, requisite, that the ordainers have in themselves formally the Office, whereunto they Ordain the person; But it is sufficient that they have a warrand from God to interveen as instruments to apply the person to the Office instituted by God. And I see nothing in the Office of an Evangelist that can prove that ordinary Officers could have no warrand from God to act in this kind of causality to the applying of a person to it. Read that which the often mentioned worthy Author hath judiciously spoken upon the nature of the Office of an Evangelist, *Miscell. c. 7. p. 93, 94.* and it will shew, I say not this without reason.

I trust by these things it appears that this instance of ordination by a Presbytery is not so far from this disputation as Mr. Lockier would have his Reader beleeve, but that it is a pattern of ordination in ordinary (which some of the most judicious of his own side acknowledge with us) shewing us also the right hands into which Christ has committed this power, to wit the Eldership. The example which he referreth us to, *Act. 13. 1. 3.* we thank him for it, as making very much against himself: For albeit *Barnabas* and *Paul*, the persons on whom the act mentioned there, passed, did not then receive any new ordination, to an Office extraordinary, as Mr. Lockier, in a mistake or inanimadvertency has imagined

when he wrot this (they were Apostles before) yet did they receive a new call unto a more particular application, or as it were appropriation of the exercise of their Office unto a certain definite charge, the Gentiles to wit, as *Paul* himself declareth it, *Gal. 2. 7.* and yet we see evidently that as this calling was not performed by the body of the Church, so it was performed by some ordinary Elders, I say not that it was by ordinary Elders only, for there were Prophets that had hand in it; But I say that ordinary Elders did also concur in it, as appears, *v. 1.* *There were at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers*; I hope it will not be denied that Teachers are ordinary Elders.

§. 6. . . 2. *Object.* Is from *1 Tim. 5. 22.* and *Tit. 1. 5.* *We read (saith he) that Titus and Timothee did ordain and are exhorted in an ordinary way to go to work by an ordinary spirit; to wit, not to lay hands suddenly on any man, nor to be partiall, but to weigh qualifications in every one, that they were blamelesse, the Husband of one wife, not accused of riot, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to filthy lustre. And this ordination they acted alone. Therefore the Eldership, may do in most weighty things in the Church without the Church, without the joint consent of the Church.* *Answer.* We bring not these places for the generall, that Acts of Government belong to the Officers of the Church only; To wit, to act therein authoritatively. But, for this particular, *ordination.* Again the Author propounds the conclusion invidiously, *without the consent of the Church.* We acknowledge that in these weighty matters the Church, i. e. the people, are to have a rationall obedientiall consent; but privat; The Question is whether they ought to have an authoritative decisive suffrage? And in the Calling of Ministers they ought to have suffrage in their election: But as for the potestative mission, or ordination, that we say, belongs to the Officers in the Church only. 3ly It is to be observed how the Author labours to cover the force of these places for proving of this, by slipping by the principall words, *Titus ordain and ordain Elders in every City,* and produces only the words of the verses following, expressing the qualifications requisite and to be presupposed in the persons that are to be ordained. In a word the argument from these places, is by him as slightly propounded.

as, I think, possibly he could. But let him take it thus. If ordination of Pastors by Apostolick authority be committed to Officers in the Church as Officers, then it belongeth not unto the people. But the former is proven from these places. Therefore, &c. The Proposition is clear of it self. The Assumption is cleared from the Texts. First, *Timothy* is charged to lay hands suddenly on no man in that same way, and under that same consideration that he is charged, not to receive an accusation against an Elder, but upon two or three witnesses testimony; And as he is charged to rebuke sins publicly, that others may fear; and that he is charged to observe these other Rules given to him for ordering his administration in the Church, *v. 19, 20, 21*. But these things are a charge given to him as a Pastor: So by what power *Titus* was charged to rebuke the *Cretians* sharply, that they might be sound in the faith, *v. 13*. By that same power was he left in *Crete* to ordain Elders in every City. But this he was to do by an Official power, and as an Officer, as is evident by comparing that *v.* with *v. 9*. Therefore, &c. Again, here is an expresse Commission to men in Office, to ordain, and charge laid upon them to be aware of doing it in a wrong way. Let the Author shew me in all the New testament, a Commission given to people to ordain Ministers, or a charge laid upon them to take heed how they ordain: But see we now the Authors Answers to these places.

S. 7.

One of these places (saith he) answers another, and openeth another. 'Tis said to *Titus*, that he should ordain Elders in every City, as *Paul* had appointed him. Now it cannot be thought in reason, that the Apostle would appoint him to ordain, other wise then he himself had ordained: but he himself did ordain by the suffrage of the people, and did establish them by the help of their fasting and prayer, *Acts 14. 23*. And this is all which is left upon record, for direction in this matter, as yet we can find, and therefore this appointment *Timothy* and *Titus* must and did follow. *Answ. 1.* True, *Paul* would not appoint *Titus* to ordain other wise then he ordained himself. But that *Paul* did ordain by the suffrage of the people is but begged: and that place, *Acts 14. 23*, does not prove it. The most that can be deduced from it, is, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordained the Elders, being nominated, designed

gued and elected, by the peoples suffrage, as is shown before, whether we refer the Author and the Reader. I shall onely note a word here of worthy *Carrwright* upon that place, *Acts 14. 23.* whereby it doth appear that, albeit he standeth for the first signification of the word *χρητογιασταις* in that place, to wit, that it importeth giving of suffrages by lifting up of hands: yet he referreth that to Election, which he will have to have been done by the people: (and we deny not this) but saith not that the people had hand in the ordination of these Elders with *Paul* and *Barnabas*. But on the contrair expressly giveth ordination to the sole Officers. *You speak untruly* (saith he to the *Rhemists*) *which accuse us, as if we so commended the Churchs Election, as we shew out the Bishops Ordination, which we not only give unto them, but make them also the chief and directors in the Election; Understanding by Bishops such as are mentioned in the Scriptures, and not humane creatures.* 2. Is this, viz. *Acts 14. 23.* all that is left upon record for direction in this matter, to wit, Ordination? Then is its sure Mr. *Lockier* has little ground for his faith that Ordination ought to be done by the people, when as we have so expresse Scriptures for Officers acting in it; And he has none for the peoples acting in it but that one, which neither mentions people, nor *et materia*, by force of the thing spoken in it, can by consequence import any more, as to them, but their suffrages for Election. 2. But it seems he has forgotten himself in short bounds: for did he not, SECT. 8. cite *Acts 1. 28.* for direction in this matter? Or has he afterward changed his minde of that place, finding that it made nothing for his purpose? But 3. He may, if he will, find more upon record for direction in this matter, besides these present two places: *Acts 6. 3, 6. Acts 13. 1, 2, 3. 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 6. 2 Tim. 2. 2.* in all which we finde Ordination performed by Officers, without people. Also *Tit. 1. 13. Rev. 3. 2, 14, 15, 16, 20. Acts 20. 28, 29.* In which places the censuring of Ministers is committed unto, and required of the Officers of the Church, which is never committed unto or required of people. Now to whom belongeth the Authority of taking away an Ecclesiastick Ministry, to the same belongeth to conser it.

Gul. Apol-
lon, Confi-
der. of sun-
drie Con-
trov. c. 4.
Pg. 78, 79

SECT.

SECTION VI.

Mr. Lockiers *Answers to some other Objection made by way of Reason* SACT. 15. 16. 17. *Examined.*

THe Author as he picked out some of the places of Scripture brought by the opposites of his way to prove the power of the Church Government to be in the hands of Church Officers only (and they are but a few of many and only concerning a particular Act of Government, Ordination, when as they bring many pregnant proofs from Scripture for the whole power of Government in general,) so he is pleased to pick out at his pleasure some few of their Arguments by way of reason. S. 1.

If the Eldership cannot determinately act in the Church without the consent of the Church, then Church-Government is a Democratic, all are Elders, and Officers, and Pastors, and Teachers, and Rulers alike, and then what needs different names, and stations, when these, as to distinct power, signifie nothing. S. 2.

Ans. We do justly charge that way of Church Government maintained by the Author and his Associates, with this, that it sets up such a Democratic or popular Government in the Church, condemned by the French Church in *Morellius*: Which also Independents themselves would fain seem to disclaim, but it will not be for them. The Author is pleased in his wisdom to propound the Argument for evidencing this, as slightly as he could: But let him take it thus; That Government in the Church wherein, albeit there be such as bear the name of Officers and Rulers, yet not only all the power of Government is placed in the body of the people as in the first and proper subject thereof, and not in their Officers; But also the whole body of the people formally and authoritatively, concur and act in the exercise of all the acts of Government, at least all acts of jurisdiction, so that all matters of this kind, are carried and determined by the authoritative suffrage, consent and dissent of the people, nothing therein being left to the Officers as Officers, but to preside and moderate the body of the people in their authoritative acting, or, may be, to prepare and ripen matters for their authoritative decision, and to be their mouth to declare the sentence

tence determined by their authority, yea and wherein, the body of the people, may authoritatively call all the Officers to a judicial account, judicially cognosce upon their Administration, censure, degrade, yea and Excommunicate them all together, such a Church Government must needs be Democraticall or popular, and therein all are Rulers and therein different names and titles signify nothing, (I say not simply but as Mr. Lockier) as to any distinct power of Authority. If any will deny the connexion of this proposition, I beseech such to give a description of a popular Government. Sure I am that the very Government of Athens it self, the most popular and Democraticall that we read of, was never more popular then that which we have expressed in the Antecedent or first part of the proposition. But now the Church Government maintained by the Author and his Associates is such in every one of these points expressed, as is undeniably evident both by their Doctrine and practice, *Ergo, &c.*

S. 3.

Now what answers the Author to this Objection? He brings us a number of words clouted up unhandisomely enough out of *Hookers Surv. Par. lib. II. c. 11.* which I think not worth the while to insist particularly upon. Briefly, the summe of all comes to this: He tells us there is a power of *Judging*, to take in and to cast out Members, to exert Office (he means to confer Office) or to degrade from Office, which he calls essential or fundamental power; And there is the manner of managing this, and exercising it: He expresseth it also, To declare, act and exercise judgment in the name of the rest, which he calls organically power, and *Possessus Officii particularis*. And tells us that that former power is common to the whole Church Elders and fraternity: The latter is in the Elders (yet I cannot understand how this can stand with what he saith, that it is *verbally* formally in one: But be it so) And so then (to wit, the Elders) power is distinctly usefull and significantive. *Ans.* To passe by here the exagitating of that distinction of a power essentiall and a power organically (the absurdity whereof in Philosophy might be shewn abundantly, might we stay upon every such trifle) and other such *minutiae*. Here, to the main purpose in hand, is To talk of, and suppose a power of judging, in taking in and casting out, investing Officers and degrading them, belonging

ing to the people and also exercised by them formally, meaning, as he doth, of authoritative judging, is but a supposing and begging the main thing in Question. The place, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. proves it not. Tho' the Epistle be writtento the whole Church of *Corinth*, yet not every command and direction there relates to all and every one in that Church, as to act formally in the work commanded or required. We say that command of casting out the incestuous person judicially respects the Officers of that Church only. See this made good by Mr. *Rutherford*. *Due Rights* pag. 36, 37. *Gal. Apollon. Consider. of certain contro. c. 4. pag. 64, 65, 66.* Mr. *Lockiers* Argument to the contrary, is weak; *The Apostle sayeth cast out from among you. But the incestuous person was not only amongst the Elders, but among the people.* What a poor Argument is this? Then it should follow, that the Women and the Children should judicially and authoritatively voice in the Excommunication of the incestuous person; For he was not only amongst the men; but also amongst the Women and Children; These, sure, were a part of the people. So then certainly the Apostle here, *cast out* from amongst you, tho' Writing to the Church of *Corinth* in generall in the Epistle, yet in this particular command, must be understood to be speaking with relation to such in the Church as were invested with a morall capacity of power and authority to act that which he was commanding. 2. When he sayeth the power of judging is common to the whole Church, Elders and fraternity, its but a fallacy as to Elders; For in effect Elders as Elders, by his way have no power of judging: As such they have only the manner of managing the judgement. 3. When he expresth the act of essentiall power (as he calleth it) competent to the whole Church, thus, *Some to judge*; and then the act of the Originall or Officiall power, thus, *Some to declare, act and exercise that judgement*: I would aske him what he meaneth by acting and exercising judgement? Either it must be the determining of the judgement; But that is nothing else but judging it self, which belongeth to the essentiall power of the whole body: Or he must understand the execution of the sentence, as for example, shunning the company of the Excommunicat; But that is no act of Office power nor of authority, but is common to all

all the Church-Men and Women : Or he must understand the publick uttering and pronouncing the sentence of judgement : But that is just all one with declaring, and to call this acting and exercising of judgement, is very abusive speaking : Except these words be used otherwise in English Language then I know of. But 4. The chiefest thing I would observe is, that the Author in saying much to the objection propounded, has said just nothing, but in effect yeelded it wholly. For when as he sayeth that the power and exercise of judging, to wit, authoritatively (for of this, and not of judging by way of privat discretion is the present discourse) belongeth equally to all the Church, and that the matter of managing this only, belongeth to the Officers, what is this but as much as if he had said in formall terms : 'Tis true, I yeeld it, the Government of the Church is Democraticall. And as for that he sayeth, that seeing the Elders have in their hands the manner of managing the judgement, *therefore their power is usefull and significative, and not uselesse and nothing from the whole.* True, it is not simply uselesse and nothing significative. But sure I am it, signifies nothing as to any power of Authority and Government. A Mr. Speaker or Presidents part in a Parliament, a Prolocutors or Moderators in an Assembly, is not simply uselesse and nothing significative, but it is just nothing significative, as to Authority or Government.

§4. 2. Obj. *But is not this confusion for all to have an hand in these great things?* This absurdity is most justly charged upon your way of Government. It is confusion to speak so, both *formally and effectively.* First I say, *formally* : For when as the Lord has instituted his Visible Church to be a body organically consisting of dissimilar parts : some as eyes, some as feet, some as hands, some to rule and some to be ruled, some to be over others to command and govern in the LORD, some to obey in the LORD : This way makes all in the Church to be Rulers, and all to be ruled, all to command and govern, and all to obey : all to be eyes and also all to be feet, and all to be one member, and so the whole not to be a body, to wit, organically and dissimilar. Yet more, it hath yet a greater confusion in it by attributing the judicall determination of all matters of Government and Jurisdiction to the suffrages of the people, who

who by Scripture are these who are to be ruled, and to obey, and are as the feet and the hands in the naturall body; Indeed it maketh these who ought to be ruled, to be the Rulers, & *contra*; Sets the feet above the head, &c. 2. Effectively, it cannot but in the exercise of it produce many confusions. Was there ever a Democratically or popular Government to this day, but it did so? And is not that the evil of popular Government: in regard of which, it is by all intelligent Politicians postponed, both to Aristocraticall and Monarchicall Government, and scarce accounted worthy the name of an allowable Government? But see we the Authors Answer.

No: *'Tis not confusion: The Church being considered as an organick body, the power of acting may be fundamentally and intrinsically in the whole, and yet each organ move orderly in his distinct place, and way. As for instance, in the naturall body of man the sensitive faculties are all in the soul originally: and the soul it self is in the whole body fundamentally, tota in toto, &c. So that the senses are radically and potentially in all the soul, and the soul radically and potentially in all the body, and yet these senses, act only by such powers (I humbly conceive this to be a fault of the Printer, and that it should be, parts) as are fit to act by, as seeing by the eye, and hearing by the eare. And the soul acts all its works by such organs as are proper to each work; The hand to work, and the feet to go.* S. 5.

I humbly conceive the Author had done better to have spared S. 6. his physiologicall simile here, and am of the mind some of his late associates here, will not comply with his physickall conceptions, whatever they esteem of his theologicall Tenets. How the sensitive faculties may be said to be all in the soul, originally, radically, and potentially, I can understand. The meaning being that the soul is the effective principle from which these faculties proceed by way of issue or emanation (as they call it) to have their subjection or inherency in their severall respective organs, and to say this is not incongruous. But how the soul can be said to be in the whole body fundamentally, radically and potentially, I cannot well understand. That the soul may be in some one part of the body as in the heart (which some) or brain (which others have thought)

N o 2

Substantially

substantially and informative, and in the whole rest of the body, *virtually and operative*, as the Sun which is substantially and locally in the Heavens, is in the Earth by its influence and operation. This I can conceive, and it is not altogether incongruous to say so, though I think it be not true. But to say the soul, especially the soul of man, is in the whole body; fundamentally, radically, and potentially, is such a solecisme (to speak so) in philosophy, as I think we shall hardly meet with one grosser amongst men of any knowledge. For then, not only, does it follow that the soul must be by way of information, only in some part of the body (which tho false, yet is not so untollerable) but also that the whole body is the effective principle from which the soul is produced and issues by way of emanation, into that part of the body which it is supposed to inform: Now how absurd this is in Philosophy, yea in Divinity, let any judicious man consider of it. But yet I further wonder, that the Author, when he is expressing this his way of the souls being in the whole body, to wit, *fundamentally, radically, &c.* he brings for it that common saying amongst the Schooles, *tota in toto & tota in qualibet parte*: For indeed that is the proper expression of their Doctrine who maintain that the soul is in the whole body, *essentially and informative*, and withall that it is in it as a spirituell forme, indivisible, without extension of parts. But to passe this and to come to our present purpose. I verily think, Mr. Lockier could not made choise of a fitter comparison to make good and establish the Objection against his way, which he pretends to answer, then that same he has pitched upon, and his own very words condemns him. He sayeth the Church is to be considered as an organical body. So it is indeed, and this will make for us, as we have shown before. Next whereas he sayeth that it being so considered, *the power of acting may be fundamentally and intrinsically in the whole, and yet each organ move orderly in his distinct place and way, as in the naturall body the sensitive faculties are in all the soul originally, &c.* To this I suppose it were true that the power of governing were in the whole body of the Church fundamentally or originally, yet it can not be said that each organ formally acteth the acts of Government; For governing being an organical act in a political body, thence

thence it should follow that all the organs were but one organ, and the body of the Church were no organick body; But a similar body: As, if each member in the naturall body did formally act *seeing*, all the members were eyes or one eye. And so, where were the body? To say that however that each member acteth in their acts of governing, yet each acteth orderly in his distinct place, viz. privat Christians in their place, Elders in their place and station: Yet this takes not away the absurdity: For seeing Mr. Lockier will have all and every one in the body of the Church formally and authoritatively to act in the acts of Government, it followes that all and every one of them are formally Governours and Rulers, the privat Christians as well as the Elders, and there is no distinction between them at all, as to governing, except of meer order in acting. Certainly if all and every member of the naturall body did formally elicit the act of *seeing*, albeit that part of the body which we now call the eye, were supposed to act therein, in some respect, somewhat distinctly, as to order, from the rest of the parts: Yet all the rest of the parts were as formally and properly an eye, as it. Therefore as it were madness to say that in the naturall body, each member doth formally act *seeing*: So it is exceeding absurd, supposing the Church to be an organick body, and some of the organs whereof it is composed, are rulers governing and commanding in the Lord, to whom subjection and obedience in the Lord is to be given by the rest, and are as the eyes in the naturall body; Yet to say, that all and every member in the Church hath a formall authoritative hand or influence in the acts of governing.

3. See the incongruity of the Authors comparison. *The power* (sayeth he) *may be fundamentally in the whole,* (viz. body. For he is speaking in the immediatly preceeding words of an organick body) *and yet each organ, &c. for instance, the sensitive faculties are in all the soul originally, &c.* What incongruity is this, to propound in the generall of power fundamentally in a whole body organick; And then for an instance or *simile* to tell us of powers or faculties in the whole soul originally? Is the soul an organick body? But may some say, the Author saith, the sensitive faculties are in all the soul fundamentally, and radically, and the soul radically and fundamentally in all the body, and so would

by

by consequence say that the sensitive faculties are in the whole body fundamentally, and radically. *Ans. 1.* 'Tis a very grosse absurdity to say that the soul is in the whole body fundamentally and radically or potentially, as we have shown before: It is formally and by way of information in the whole body. 2. It is a grosse inconsequence, the sensitive faculties are in all the soul, and the soul is in the whole body: Therefore the sensitive faculties are in the whole body fundamentally. Nay, they are fundamentally and radically in the soul, and therefore are not fundamentally and radically in the body, neither whole nor part. But are formally and by way of inhesion, in their respective parts or organs of the body. 3. I would fain know of the Author what he does make in the Church answerable to the soul in the naturall body, and so that wherein the power of governing is fundamentally and radically, as the sensitive faculties of the naturall body are fundamentally and radically in the soul? Is it the whole Church as comprehending both people and Ministers? That is the body. Or is it, the people? That is a part of the body. The truth is, *Mr. Lockier* is at a losse here with his *simile*. Jesus Christ as King of the Church is unto the Church as the soul in the naturall body; And the power of governing is fundamentally and radically in him, and not in the body of the Church. And therefore, 3. to make use of the last words of his *similitude* (for which we thank him as making clearly against himself and for us) as the sensitive faculties are radically and fundamentally in the soul, and act only (as he sayeth well) by such parts as are fit to act by, as seeing by the eye, and hearing by the ear, and the soul acts all its works by such organs as are proper to each work; The hands to work, the feet to go: So (to give the *apodosis* which he had no will to expresse) Ecclesiastick organick powers (such as the senses are in the naturall body) as the power of governing, teaching, administrating the seals are fundamentally in Christ the King of the Church, and act only by such parts as are fit to act by, Rulers, Teachers, and Ministers: These are the proper organs of those works.

5. 7. The fifth and last Obj. he meeteth with is this. *The Elders of the Church are called overseers, stewards, shepherds, fathers: All which in their analogy, hold forth a peculiar and sole power*

do things, fathers govern alone, *soverseers*, &c. As to this propounding of this Argument. 1. We speak not for a peculiar sole power to do things indefinitely, in Elders; But for a sole power of authoritative acting in maters of Government, and not extending or denying unto people a private judgement of discretion to try and prove the actings thereof by the rule. 2. The Author leaves out some of the names and titles given to the Elders, which use to be alledged in this Argument, besides the name *ἐπισκοποι*, Elders, as *πρεσβυτεροι*, guides, leaders, conducters, governours, *Heb.* 13. 7. 17. 24. *ποιται*, *πρωτοπρεσβυτεροι*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Rom.* 12. 8. 1 *Thessal.* 5. 12. *ἐκκλησιασται*, Governments, or Governours, the abstract being put for the concrete, 2 *Cor.* 12. 28. 3. Because the Author is pleased to propound the Argument from this ground, in the softest way for his own advantage; we desire the Reader will be pleased to take it thus. These persons and these only in the Church have power and authority to govern, and consequently are to exercise formally acts of Government, to whom in the Scripture by the Spirit of Christ are appropriated such names and titles, which do import the power and authority of governing. But to the Officers of the Church are such names appropriat as importeth power and authority of Governing, *Ergo*, &c. For the major or first proposition, I think it may be clear to any of it self. And if any shall be so wilfull as to deny it, I would ask him (as doth the learned Authors of *jus divinum* of Church Government, *Par.* 2. pag. 170.) to what end and for what reason are such names and denominations importing power and authority of Government, appropriated to some persons, i.e. given to them and not to others, if not for this end and reason, to distinguish them that are vested with authority to govern in the Church, from others, and to signifie, and hold forth a duty or work inebument to them and not to others? The assumption see evidenced at length, in *jus divinum* of Church Government, *Par.* 2. pag. 171, 172, 173, the summe is this. These titles, Elder, Overseer, *ἐπισκοπος*, Conductor, Governour, *πρεσβυτερος* Steward, Pastor, Governments, Ruler, are names which generally have power and authority given upon them and are such names. as not only heathen writers, but also the Greek Version of the Old Testament by the 72. and the Originall of the New Testament are

wont

what is give to politicall Officers, to expresse their politicall power and government, now all these titles and denominations, are attributed to Christs Officers in his Church, as cannot be denyed. And are not any where in Scripture attributed to the whole Church or any other member of the Church whatsoever, besides Church Officers: Nay, they are ordinarily attributed to the Officers in contradistinction to the body of the Church. But see we what the Author answers.

§. 8.

Mennius (saith he first in generall) in Parables must not be fastened on, but principalia, what is their main scope. *Ans.* What? And are all these names given to Christs Officers in his Church nothing else but parables? Or are they Parables at all, taking them as titles or names given to the Officers in the Church? I have thought a Parable (as we take it now in the Scripture sense) to be *narratio rei vera vel verisimiliter gesta ad simile significandum seu explicandum* (as *Pareus* describeth, *Math.* 13. 3.) i. e. a narration of a thing truly done, or probable, to signifie or explain a like thing: and not a simple term or title given to a thing. Indeed some of them, no doubt, are metaphorical; But a simple Metaphor, for ought I know, is not a Parable. And I pray, when the Apostle saith, *Rom.* 12. 8. *He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence.* And *1 Corin.* 12. 28. *God hath set in the Church — governments.* And *1 Thessal.* 5. 11. *Know those that are over you, $\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, in the Lord,* and other such places; is the Apostle in these places speaking parables? But be it so that the Author, takes a parable for a simple Metaphore. Will any man but the Author say that all and every one of these forementioned names are attributed to the Officers of Christ in the Church, only Metaphorically, and none of them in a proper signification. Indeed some of them I confesse are Metaphorical, as Father, Pastors, or Shepherds, Stewards: But withall others of them, as, Presbyters (in the politicall sense of the word) Rulers, $\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, $\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, are as properly and univocally attributed to them as unto such as in the civil Common-wealth have the same names attributed to them. The *Philosopher* tells us, *Categor.* c. 1. that these are *Synonyma*, and so participate a name properly, which have not only the name common, but also the same definition accommodated.

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. The text is arranged in several paragraphs across the page.]



This which we have considered is all that Mr. Lockier answereth § 11. to the Argument for proving the power of Ecclesiastick Government to belong to Christs Officers in the Church only, and not to the whole body of Beleevers or Professours, taken from the names and denominations, importing power and authority of Government given by the Spirit of God in Scripture to the Officers, but never to the people, then to them in contradistinction to the people. And all that he has said as it is but weak in it self (as we trust we have made evident) so he has therein passed by a great part of the Argument, having neglected sundrie of these Titles, and altogether miskenned the Passages of Scripture, which by Presbyterians use to be produced for them, and are urged upon the point as containing much ground for their Doctrine, besides the names or titles given therein to the Officers. I humbly desire the Reader, & our Author if he will be pleased to be at the pains, to consider what M. Gillespy hath to this purpose, *Arrows Rod, Book 2. c. 9.* wherein he proveth that there ought to be an Ecclesiastick Government in the hands of the Church Officers, see there Arg. 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 19, 20. But now are these Objections brought by the Author and as slightly propounded as he might, and, I may say, Answered just so; Are these, I say, all the materiall Arguments that he could find used by Presbyterians to prove the power and authority of Ecclesiastick Government to be in the hands not of the people, but only of the Church Officers? I cannot think he will say so, if he has been at the pains to Read them. Why then has he passed others in silence, if he minded to give his rationall Readers satisfaction touching his Tenet in this Question? We refer the Reader to see these touched at by the Author here, more pregnantly managed, and others besides them, in *Jus Divin. of Church Government, part. 2. c. 10, and c. 11. Sect. 2. Gal. Argyllon. Considerat. of certain Controv. c. 4. Spanhem. Epist. to David Buchan. g. 2. Mr. Rath. Peaceable Plea, and Due Right.* Now come we to Mr. Lockiers second Assertion.

SECTION VII.

Mr. Lockers 2. *Assertion touching Presbyteries of many particular Congregations combined (whether Classicall or Synodical) and their power considered, and the true state of the Controversie touching this matter between Presbyterians and Independents layed forth.*

S. 1. *In the former Assertion the Author would throw the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven, the power of the Government of the Church, out of the hands of them whom Christ has appointed to be Rulers over the Church, his Officers, to put the same in the hands of all and every one of the people. And in the second he would so put them in the hands of one particular Congregation (may be, of seven or ten persons: For of so many may a Church be completely constitute by their way), as that they shall exercise all that power, even to the highest acts thereof, Independently as the supream Tribunal in Ecclesiastick Government under Jesus Christ, upon earth: So as that if there should be any error committed by such a particular Congregation, suppose the greatest error or heresie in Doctrine maintained by it, or a man unjustly Excommunicated and casten out of the Church, there is no Ecclesiastick authoritative remedy under Heaven to redresse such an error: No Ecclesiastick Judicatory, to which a grieved person may have recourse, by appeal for Authoritative recognition, or redresse of his grievance: But see we his Assertion.*

S. 2. *That Presbyteries or Elderships without the particular Congregations, exercising authoritative and coercive power over it, are an invention of man. Having thus propounded his Assertion, He explains the subject of it thus. By Presbyteries or Elderships without the Congregation, I mean such an Eldership as is chosen out of severall particular Congregations, assuming to themselves, superiour and decisive power over them. Afterward he calls it*

foetate

forrain Eldership, SECT. 20. And so forth in the rest of his Book. And then again undertaking to explain the nature thereof, sayeth, *I find among our Brethren themselves that Elders and Brethren, sent and empowered from their severall Congregations, respectively, to transact, and conclude such and such Ecclesiastick affairs within such a limied bounds, ex sua potestate, are a forrain Presbytery.* A note or two upon these things and then we shall more clearly and distinctly set forth the true state of the Controversie, and what is our Doctrine therein. 1. Whereas he propounds to himself to Dispute against the Authority of an Eldership or Presbytery *without* the particular Congregation, i.e. as he calls it afterward, forrain to the Congregation, he but enters in a contest against his own fiction. And whereas he sayeth, SECT. 20. that he finds, amongst their Brethren. (he means Presbyterians) that a Presbytery sent from severall Congregations is a forrain Presbytery. I humbly conceive, for ought I can remember of any of them, he wrongs them exceeding much. I do not remember of any Presbyterian, that acknowledges the Presbytery of severall Congregations associat in Government, to be a forrain or extrinsecall Presbytery, to these Congregations: Nor is it so indeed. It cannot be called a forrain Presbytery to all the Congregations associat under it; Because it is made of their own severall Elderships: Nor yet can it be forrain or externall to any of them; Because every one is a part of it, and in it as a part of the whole. As a Parliament cannot be called a forrain Judicatory to the whole Kingdom whereof it is the Parliament, nor unto any of the severall Cities or Counties, which are parts of the Kingdom, and are in the Parliament by their Deputies or Commissioners, as parts constituents thereof. Indeed the Prelate and his Cathedrall consistory taking to themselves the Government and Jurisdiction over all Congregations in the Diocese were an externall & forrain Judicatory to these Churches, because they excluded the other Congregations and their Elderships from all collaterall concurrence and copartnership with them in the Government. But the Presbytery we speak for, is made up of the Elders of the severall Congregations which it governs, as intrinsecall collaterall parts constituent thereof, and therefore cannot be called forrain to these severall

Congregations. 1. When as he expresseth the power of these Presbyteries against which he propounds this dispute, under the name of *coercive*, calling it a *coercive power*. He seemeth on purpose to choise an odious word, to render it suspicious by the very name; For the word of *coercing*, in the common use, mostly seemeth to import, outward bodily or civill force exercised upon persons or things, to stop and repress their actions, *ipsi etiam renitentibus*, we ascribe no such power unto Presbyteries: But a power of executing spirituall censures which have no external force upon persons, nor Physicall neither, but only Morall, as administered by the Eldership: Tho they may be accompanied by God, With a Physicall (I mean a reall) operation upon the persons, either in mercy or judgement. And if at any time those who are for Presbyteries over more Congregations, speaking of their power, call it *coercive*, they mean no other thing, but a power of Spirituall jurisdiction exercised in Spirituall censures, such as the Author himselfe and these of his way, attributes to particular Elderships of a single Congregation together with the Congregation over every member thereof. If the Author had dealt ingenuously with us, he should not use such a word without explanation of the thing, he knoweth we mean. But now let's see the clear state of the controverſie in this matter.

5. 3. The subject in generall, whereupon the Question runneth between us and the Independent Brethren, is a Presbytery or Eldership of more Congregations then one. Concerning which, there are some things, confessed and uncontroverted, whetoe of we should take notice in the first place that we may the better see where the difference and controverſie lyeth. 1. 'Tis confessed by our Brethren themselves that consociation of more particular Churches or Congregations in one Presbytery or Eldership is lawfull and usefull *Hooker Surv. p. 4. c. 1. 2.* 2. That these consociations are and may be of severall sorts and degrees, some lesser, some greater, Classes, Synods, and these Provincially, Nationall, Oecumenicall, *Idem, Ibid.* So then there is no controverſie about the being simply of Elderships and Presbyteries of more Congregations consociated, that they may lawfully be, and of diverse sorts is confessed.

But

But there are these points especially concerning them of which there is controversie between us and our Brethren.

The 1. is concerning the nature of their power over the severall Congregations or Churches consociated in them. Our Brethren of the Independent way attribute no other power unto them but of counsell, & perswasion to informe and hold forth unto the Churches what is commanded by the Word of God, & to exhort & perswade them to their duty, to obedience of what they find commanded in the Word; But allow them no authority and jurisdictionall power to enjoin their determinations from the Word authoritatively under pain of Ecclesiasticall censures. So Mr. Hooker, in the forescited place, pag. 2, 3. 'tis true he calls this power of counsell by the name of Authority. And so Mr. Lockier from him, Sect. 30. but an authoritative power of meer counsell, advice and perswasion may be justly counted a Chimera. But we shall not contend about names; Call it authority or power or what you will, the thing it self is nothing else but brotherly counsell, which hath no binding force formally as issuing from the Presbyterie: But bindeth merely *in materia*, materially in regard of the thing which is propounded by them, as it is a Scripture truth or command, as is confessed by Mr. Hooker; And this is no more then one Brother may do towards another, and one sister Church may do to another. Mr. Cotton in the Keyes, ch. 6. seemeth to attribute more power to a Synod. They have (sayeth he) power not onely to give light and counsell in mater of truth and practice: But also to command and enjoin the things to be believed and done. The express words of the Synodicall letter imply no lesse, Act. 15. 27. It is an act of the power of the Keyes, to binde burdens; and this binding power ariseth not onely materially from the weight of the matters imposed (which are necessary, necessitate pracepti from the word) but also formally from the authority of the Synod, which being an ordinance of Christ, hindereth the more. For the Synods sake. This in the tetter of the words is a flat contradiction to what Mr. Hooker sayeth. He sayeth they have only a power of Brotherly counsell. Mr. Cotton not only that, but also to command and enjoin. He sayeth they bind only materially, because what they determine is either expressed in, or infallibly collected out of the Word:

Mr. Cotton

Mr. *Cotter*, not only *materially*, but also *formally*, from the authority of the Synode. Yet I conceive for all such fair words, in the intension and reall meaning of the Author, little more is understood than what Mr. *Hooker* sayeth, at most nothing more but a Doctrinall power, which is competent to any single Pastour as M. *Coadrey* sheweth *Vindicia slav. c. 6. pag. 53.* We, on the contrary assert that by warrand of the Word of God, the Presbyteries of associated Churches, Classicall or Synodicall, have a power and authority of Spirituall jurisdiction, whereby they authoritatively discern matters Ecclesiasticall and impose these decrees under pain of Ecclesiastick censures, and may inflict Ecclesiastick censures upon the disobedient and refractory in the particular Congregations within the combination or association. Only let it be observed here, that this authoritative and juridicall power we attribute to such Presbyteries of discerning matters Ecclesiasticall, and imposing their determinations under pain of censure, is not Autocratic and absolute, binding absolutely, by vertue of their authority; But Ministeriall, and adstricted in its determination to the rule of the Word of God: So that that obligation formally which floweth from the authority of the Judicatory into the decree *in actu exercito*, presupposeth that materiall obligation of the thing decreed, as contained in the Word of God, else it hath not place.

2. Point of Controversie is, that the Independent Brethren do not allow the standing use of such associated Presbyteries: But only occasionall: We assert that by warrand of the Word of God some such Presbyteries are of standing use as standing ordinary judicall Ecclesiasticall Courts. We say that Classicall Presbyteries, in the ordinary settled case of Churches are necessary standing Courts for administration of Ecclesiasticall Government, and also that Superiour Presbyteries, Synodicall, may be warrantably of standing use where and when conveniently, moe Presbyteriall or Classicall Churches may have and enjoy actual combination, as of Yearly Provinciaall Synods, as in the Churches of the Low Countries are more frequent Provinciaall Synods, and yearly National Assemblies, as in the Churches of this Kingdome of Scotland.

3. Point is concerning subordination of lesser Assemblies to greater.

greater. The Independent Brethren deny altogether subordination of Inferiour Assemblies to Superiour as juridicall Ecclesiasticall Courts. Albeit they acknowledge that difficulties arising in a particular Congregation in matters of Government, there may be a going out to an Assembly of more Churches, and if need be, full satisfaction and clearing not being found there, there may be a going forth yet to a greater and more large Assembly. Yet they say, that is elective and only by way of reference and arbitration, and only for counsell and direction, and assert, that a particular Congregation is the supream Ecclesiasticall Juridicall Tribunal under Jesus-Christ upon earth. So that a person although wronged by an unjust sentence there (as they are not in their determinations infallible) suppose sentenced to Excommunication (which cutteth him off from the benefit of Church Ordinances and fellowship of Christians in all the Churches of the World) he may have no appeal from their sentence to another Superiour Judicatory to have his processe juridically recognosced, and the injurious sentence re-versed, but must ly under it without any Ecclesiastick remedy till death, unless that particular Congregation be pleased themselves to revoke their sentence. So doth Mr. Hooker tell us, *Survey*, par. 3. c. 3. pag. 40, 41, 43. and par. 4. pag. 19. We, on the contrary, assert that both the Law of Nature, and the positive Law of God revealed in his Word, both in the Old and New Testament, holdeth out to us a juridicall subordination of lesser Assemblies Ecclesiasticall unto greater, so that appeals may be made from Inferiour and lesser, to Superiour and greater Assemblies. That it is both against the Law of nature and the positive Law of God to place a supream, Independent Ecclesiasticall juridicall power in a particular Congregation, yea, or in any lesser Assembly when as a greater and Superiour is to be had and may conveniently be had. We assert also that, that series and gradation of this subordination which is acknowledged and maintained by Protestant Churches, viz. of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies is lawfull and agreeable to the Word of God.

Whereas there are these three principal points of Controverſie concerning the matter in hand. The thing Mr. Lockyer proponeth to dispute against in his Assertion, is that which is asserted, by

us in the first point: Yet some of his Arguments afterward used, touch not at that, but against the third, a series of subordination of Inferiour Assemblies to Superiour. But come we now to consider his proofs such as they are, and let the Reader have before his eyes the true state of the Question as laid forth by us.

SECTION VIII.

His first Ground brought against a Presbytery, having authorisative juridicall power over more Congregations (prosecute by him, Sect. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.) Examined.

MR. Lockier undertakes by four mediums to prove that a Presbytery having juridicall power and authority over more Congregations is but an humane invention. 1. Because they are without a foundation in the Word. This he undertakes to make good by clearing these Scriptures on which such Presbyteries are built: And brings in four Scriptures, *Act. 1. 15, 23. Act. 4. 35. Act. 15. 28. 1 Tim. 4. 14.* So that his first Argument comes to this much in full matter and forme: If such a Presbytery over more Congregations had any foundation in the Word it were in some of those four places: But in none of those hath it foundation, therefore not at all in Scripture: But now tho his assumption were granted, and he did clearly evidence that in none of these mentioned places, it hath sufficient foundation: Yet I must say, he does very grossly despise his Reader (to say the least) in his major proposition. What did never Mr. Lockier read in Presbyteriall writers any other Scripturall grounds brought to prove such a Presbytery but these 4 places, might he not at least have read sundry others? Let him read them over again, and I believe, besides these mentioned, he shall find other grounds of Scripture brought to prove such a Presbytery, as he shall never be able to withstand the force of. For instance, let him consider the Argument grounded upon *Matth. 18. 17, 18.* brought by *Gul. Apoll. consideras. of certain contron. c. 6. p. 94. 95.* on which place *Parker* himself, *de Polu. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 24.* groundeth

groundeth the authority of Synods. 2. The Argument grounded upon 1 Cor. 14. 23. in that same Author, pag. 98. 99. 3. The Argument brought from what the Scripture holdeth forth concerning the Churches of *Jerusalem, Ephesus, Antioch, Corinth, Assembly of Divines*. 4. Proposition concerning *Presbyterial Government*, with the defences thereof against the Reasons of the *Dissenting Brethren*. In *Divin. of Church Government*, Part. 2. c. 13. 4. The Argument grounded upon practice of the Church under the Old Testament in matter of Government, wherein it was not pedagogicall and ceremoniall, but essentiall and of morall conveniency and so perpetuall. *Gen. Apollon*, pag. 96. 97. Did Mr. Lockier never Read these grounds of Scripture urged in this matter by Presbyterians, that alledging here that such a Presbytery hath no foundation in Scripture, and taking upon him to make out this, by clearing such Scripture grounds as are brought for it, pisseth these in silence? If not, I wonder much he should come to handle this controversie, having taken so little pains to be acquainted with his adversaries' grounds: Or if he has read them, why has he passed them by without an essay to clear them. If he contemned them, we tell him it is easier to contemne them, then to answer them. But come let us see the places he has been pleased to take notice of, and what he hath upon them to the purpose.

The first is, *Acts. 15. 23.* *On The eleven Apostles here met together, and these as a supreme body over all others, govern the Church at Jerusalem, dictate what and how to be done, in that case of issue upon the Church, which sheweth that there is a sovraign* (put out that name, as none of ours, but a nick-name and misfalling of the thing signified by your self) *authoritative Eldership over particular Churches.* *Answer.* I do not remember of any Presbyterian Writer that bringeth this place as a full proof of a Presbytery ruling over more Congregations, albeit, may be, some arguing from the Government of the Church of *Jerusalem*, viz. 1. That that Church consisted of more Congregations then one. 2. That these diverse single Congregations are held forth as one Church. 3. That they are under one common Presbytery Governing them; Some, may, may be, bring that place jointly

5. 2.

with others to make up a proof of that complex medium. Let Mr. Lockier point us at the man that brings it as a full proof by it self. 'Tis an easie thing for men to devise, at their own pleasure, Arguments as used by their adversaries and then seem to get a victory over them, when as indeed they are but fighting against their own fictions. So we need not trouble our selves with following Mr. Lockiers Answers to this place. Only I shall note some few things said by him in his Answers, which are two.

- S. 3. In the first, *The station of the Apostles* (sayeth he) was extraordinary to take care of all Churches: Being therefore by this place Elders in all Churches, might and did interpose their power in severall particular Churches — And therefore what they did *modo extraordinario*, is not competent to be exemplary; extraordinary practises, are not fit matter to make up ordinary precedents. *Ans.* That it pertained to the extraordinary Office of the Apostles, as Apostles, to exercise their power of Teaching and Governing in all particular Churches, without any particular call, we confesse it true. But that their Ruling of more particular Congregations then one, simply, was extraordinary, and that when they did this, they did it *modo extraordinario*, may well be confidently said, but will never be proven. And how will Mr. Lockier prove that there were no ordinary Elders with the Apostles in that meeting. I think he shall find this an hard stick of work. But passing these things now. I would here ask him one thing. Why is it that he bringeth this as a solution to this place, *Ans.* 1? Does he mean indeed that the Apostles acted in this matter *modo extraordinario*, and according to their Apostolicall Office? Why then did he before, Sect. 10, alledge the managing of this matter of *Matthias* call, as a ground and patern for ordinary ordination of Elders?

- S. 4. In his second solut. I shall take notice of these things. 1? That, true it is the eleven Apostles were here together because they were commanded by Christ to abide in Jerusalem, untill they were endowed with the Holy Ghost from above. But there was nothing here done, but any one of them might have done it. I would ask what he intends by this? Is his meaning, that it was but by accident that they did act together in *Collegio*, in this business,

and

and that they acted as Apostles only, because what they did any one of them might alone have done what they did? And therefore it is no wayes a patern for a Colledge of ordinary Elders acting jointly their ordinary power? But 1. tho it be true that they were together in *Jerusalem*, by Gods command waiting together for the powring out of the Holy Ghost: Yet it follows not, that by accident they did joyne in *Collegio* for that businesse: Because being together, by Christs institution they were to joyne together in managing the affairs of the Church; They were bound and it was necessary that they should do so. 2. True, what was done might have been done by any one of them alone; had they been alone: But it followeth not that being all in one place, where they might joyn together, *hic & nunc*, any one of them might do it alone: Nor does it follow either, that they acted as Apostles, because any of them might have done it alone. Any of the Apostles might alone, by decisive sentence, determined the controversie Synodically concluded. *Act. 15.* yet the Author will not for this, say, that in that businesse the Apostles acted as Apostles. The next thing I note, is a great mistake of our mind concerning the nature of the Presbytery ruling over more Congregations then one. *That it should be a combination of appropriate Elders to severall particular Churches, which these Acts 1. were not, but generall Officers.* We do not think it is necessary to the essence of such a Presbytery, that it be made up of Elders, appropriated to severall fixed Congregations. We say, at the first where there were more Professours then could meet in one Congregation, their Pastours and Elders did teach and rule them in common, not being distributively appropriated to the severall Congregations, and that yet in some Cities where there are more Congregations, it may be so, as it is at this day in some Protestant Churches: Tho we think, that now in the ordinary condition of the Church, it is convenient that Congregations be fixed, and have their severall fixed Officers: Therefore we say further, what ever use be to be made of the present passage, *Act. 1.* in the Question in hand, it is but a poor Argument the Author insinuateth. There was not here concurring Elders of other Churches, this of *Jerusalem* being the first and only Gospel Church, *Ergo*, there was not here a Presbytery ruling

King over more Congregations then one, it doth not necessarily follow. For that very Church of *Jerusalem* might be made up of severall Congregations, nor can the contrary be proven; the number of names set down, *v. 15.* will not prove it, because it cannot be demonstrated that that was the whole number of Christians in *Jerusalem*.

S. 5.

The second Scripture he mentioneth with is, *Act. 4. 35.* For as many as were Possessors of lands &c. sold them and brought the price and layed it down at the Apostles feet. And how this place will maintain a * *foraine carriage* Elder ship I do not yet understand. *Ans.* Here againe is a grosse mistake or a wilfull wronging of his adversaries. I know none that alledges this place by it self as an inlie Argument to prove the Presbytery we speak for, the truth as to the use of this passage by Presbyterians in this controversee is this. They alledging the instance of the Church of *Jerusalem* for a pattern of more Congregations than one, under one government Presbytery, and for making out this, alledging that Scripture holdeth forth. 1. That Church to consist of more Congregations then one. 2. That yet these are called one Church. 3. That over these Congregations called one Church was one Presbyteriall Government in common. To prove the last of these points whereof the Argument consisteth, alledging that the Scripture mentioneth the Officers of that Church as meeting together in common for acts of Government, they bring this place for one instance of an act of Government for which they were met, *viz.* to take charge of the Churches goods, and of the due distribution thereof. See *Jus Divinum of Church Govern. part 2. pag. 210.* Now see we his answer if it hath any thing to infringe that for which this is indeed alledged.

S. 6.

The Apostles though they had a capacity over many Churches, yet then there were not many Churches, when this was done. *Ans.* Yes, Sr, there were many, more than one Church, I mean more particular Congregations, even in *Jerusalem*, see this proven by sundry others, so particularly by the Assembly of Divines in their third proposition concerning Government, and their answers to the reasons of the Dissenting Brethren, and by the Authors of *Jus Divin. 2. part pag. 193, 194, 195, 196, & seq.* and the exceptions brought

* This name the Author will put in every turn, which we desire may be as often rejected as wrongfully given to the Presbytery we speak for.

brought to the contrary by your strongest heads fully cleared. I wonder the Author should so contemne his Readers, as to obtrude his bare Assertions upon them, in a matter concerning which he knows so much reason hath been brought, as is extant, to the contrary of what he affirmeth. If he hath any new exceptions against the proofs of that particular, which hath not been brought by these of his side before him, he would done best to have produced the same; Or let him do it yet, and we shall take them into impartial consideration.

2. *And this capacity (to wit, that the Apostles had over many Churches) was as they were Apostles, and not as ordinary Elders.*

Ans. That a capacity, to act acts of Church Government over many Congregations, simply, was competent to them only *qua* Apostles, and so not competent to ordinary Elders, is a maine part of the Question in hand, and should not be begged or nakedly affirmed, but proven.

3. *And in this matter they did an extraordinary thing, because the Officers fit for this work were not yet ordained.* *Ans.* What is this? And was the Apostles receiving and ordering these alms, the doing of an extraordinary thing? Sure it was not extraordinary in the nature of the acts: For then it should not be an act competent to any ordinary Officer in the Church, which is confessedly false, it being an ordinary act which may be, and is daily done by ordinary Officers. Nor yet can it be said to have been an extraordinary deed as done by such Officers, the Apostles: The Author indeed imports this in his reason. *Because the Officers fit for this work were not yet ordained*, so he would say the Apostles were not fit Officers for that work, and therefore their doing of it was extraordinary, but either they were not fit Officers in point of qualification and endowments requisite to manage that work, and this I think the Author will not say: Or they were not fit in point of vocation to exercise such an act: But as little reason has he to say this, because, altho that businesse was not the proper act of their Apostolick vocation and office, nor the maine and principall work thereof, and therefore say they, *Act. 6. 2. It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables*: And therefore it was necessary some Officers should be ordained who's more proper

per and chief work it might be to see to that business: Yet certainly the Apostolick office, containing in it *eminently*, the power of all inferiour Officers in the Church, it was an act formally belonging to their office, and no Question even after these ordinary Officers were appointed particularly to attend that business, yet the Apostles did not then altogether cease from joining in acting thereanent, where they might conveniently without hindring their main work, the preaching and spreading of the Gospel.

¶ 5. 8. *But in all this where are joint voices and suffrages of Officers, Elders and Brethren of diverse particular Churches, commissioned to this work to make up this Presbytery, we speak of. Answer.* There was joint acting of Officers of more Congregations than one, the many Congregations whereof the Church of Jerusalem did consist (whether they were distinguished and fixed, in Members and Officers, or not, is all one) and these Officers, Elders to these Churches, the Apostles, who as they were Officers, so were Elders too, and acting as Elders because in a matter competent to ordinary Elders, and jointly. 2. Brethren not Officers, may be present in such a Presbytery and speak and give their consultative judgement orderly: But as no constituent parts of this Presbytery in our judgement, nor according to the truth. 3. When the Presbytery of more Congregations than one is made up of all the Elders of these Congregations assembled together personally, a particular commission for that is not necessary. Indeed in such Presbyteries as all the Elders of the severall Churches meet not personally, but by some of their number delegated, it is (as in Synods) necessary that these who make up such a Presbytery be commissioned from their severall Churches *respective*: Yet by that commission, they get not power *simply* to act, the acts of Government therein (that they have by their ordination to their office) but a particular warrand and call to act that power *else & none* for the good of the Churches in the combination.

¶ 5. 9. In the same SECT. vii. 25. from what he has answered to the former passage, he labours to answer other two places. 1. That Act. 6. 3, 4, 5, 6. about the choosing of Deacons and their ordination. To which his answer is. *The Apostles as extraordinary persons layed hand on these; But what appears from hence of such an Elder'ship,*

ship, accepted and commissioned from several Churches, as Presbyterians now assert and use, is yet to find. *Ans.* 1. I wonder that Mr. Lockier should obtrude upon us such a naked Assertion, that the Apostles did lay hands upon and ordain these Deacons: as extraordinary persons, i.e. as Apostles and not as Elders, without making the last essay of answer to that reason brought by the Reverend Assembly of Divines against the dissenting Brethren asserting the same. *Ans. to the reasons of the Dissenting Brethren,* pag. 52. I present it here in their own words, that the Reader may consider if it be not of such weight as Mr. Lockier had cause to take it unto consideration if he had not thought fitter to dictate to, than by light of reason to convince the judgement, of his Readers. "As for that ordination, *Act. 6.* we doubt not to say that in it they did act partly as Apostles, partly as Elders: In constituting an office in the Church which was not before, they did act their Apostolicall authority: But in ordaining unto that office men whom the Church had chosen, they did act as Presbyters; And we doubt not but that our Brethren will herein concur with us: For if they will not say that they did herein act partly as Apostles, and partly as Elders, they must say they acted either only as Apostles, or only as Elders. If only as Elders, thence it will follow that all Elders have power not only to ordain men, but to erect new Offices in the Church: If only as Apostles, then hence is no warrant for any Elders, so much as to ordain men unto an office. But I yet wonder so much the more at this Assertion of Mr. Lockier here, remembering what he had delivered before, *SECT. 10.* where he drawes an Argument from ordination of Elders performed by the Apostles for regulating the ordination of Elders in Churches now, and thereupon alledging (tho groundlessely) that the Apostles in ordination took in the people to concurrence with them, concludeth, that now also they ought to concur formally in that act. If they had acted as extraordinary persons, as Apostles, the people could not concur jointly with them in such an act, nor could it been an Argument brought as a pattern ordinary. Now if they acted not by their extraordinary office and power in ordaining Elders, what reason is there to say, that in the ordination of these Deacons, they acted in that way? 2.

As

As to that, *but what appears from hence, &c.* We say, supposing that the Church of *Jerusalem* was made up of many Congregations, and these Congregations were one Church (which are proven from other Scriptures) we find from hence, for proving such a Presbytery as we speak for, Officers of these Congregations meeting together for Government, and joining in an act of Government, ordination of Church Officers, *viz.* The Apostles doing this, and that as Elders, which is the thing it is brought for by Presbyterians; Which tho- by it self makes not a full *medium* to prove that Presbytery, yet with the other suppositions taken with it, makes very much to prove it.

- S. 10. 3. Place is, *Act. 20. 18.* The Elders there are shewed not to be Elders of many Churches which Paul sent for. but the Elders of the Church, v. 17. of one Church, of the Church of *Ephesus*, and charging them to attend to the flock, and not to flocks, *ver. 28.* here is no joyned voice of various commissioned Elders. *Ans.* To passe that some of his own, the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly, once in their Reasons against the instance of the Church of *Ephesus*, make these, both Elders and flocks, to whom the Apostle speaketh, to be of all *Asia* (& not only of *Ephesus*) where no doubt there were more particular Churches; To passe this, because indeed these same Authors a little after, when it may serve their turn, they confine them to *Ephesus*: We grant 'tis true they were Elders of one Church, the Church of *Ephesus*: But withall, we say, that one Church, was not one single Congregation, but made up of more then one, and consequently was one Presbyteriall Church. This is proven by sundry Learned, particularly by the Reverend Assembly of Divines in their instance of the Church of *Ephesus*, and all the Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren brought to the contrary fully discussed in their Answers thereunto. As for the Authors Grammaticall Argument, they are called *Elders* of the Church in the Singular Number, not *Churches*, and they are bid attend the flock, not flocks, *Ergo*, it was but one single Congregation, 'tis silly, and might well be said among Children, but may blush to come out before understanding Men. By this Argument when our Saviour sayeth, upon this Rock will I build my Church. And the Apostle, 1 Cor. 12. He hath set in the Church, *First*
from

some Apostles, &c. *Apd Ephes. 5. He loved his Church and gave himself for it:* Because it is in the Singular Number, *Church*, not *Churches* in all these places: Therefore it must be only one single Congregation meant in all of them. When as it is indeed the whole Catholick Church, and not any particular singular Congregation. So the name flock in the Singular Number, why may it not be taken *collective* for such a flock as contained in it diverse particular flocks, as *Gen. 33. 13. yea* and in the very present Metaphoricall sense *John 12. 32. little flock*, and *John 10. 16. one Sheep fold*, tho both in the Singular Number yea, and in the latter place, with the Cardinall number added to it, *one*, signifieth the Church Catholick, and so comprehendeth many particular Flocks, Folds, and Churches. As to Mr. Lockiers last words in this Sect. *here is no joint voice. &c.* indeed we grant that in that meeting there was no joint voting of Elders: Because these Elders then were not meet to act in Government, but had been sent for by *Paul*, to receive direction from him concerning the managing of their charge: But supposing that which is proved from other places, that there were more single Congregations in *Ephesus* than one, we find here these Congregations held forth to be one Church, and there were many Elders over these many Congregations as one flock, one Church. And that is enough for our purpose.

The next place he meeteth with and which he calleth one of the most weighty (indeed it is so weighty to the purpose we are on, that it crusheth the new Supreme Independent Tribunall erected by our Brethren in single Congregations) is that concerning the Synod, *Act. 15. 28.* To this the Author Answers, 1. *Here (sayeth he) is an Eldership of severall Churches (indeed) met:* But as touching the coercion of their power, as such excommunicated Eldership enforcing their results upon other Churches, this is the other thing to be brought in to make up the business we dispute against. *Answer.* First, 'tis well Mr. Lockier acknowledgeth that was an Eldership of severall Churches, even a Synodical Presbytery, a Synod, as himself calls it afterward, *Sect. 29.* Some of his side have said otherwise, the Dissenting Brethren in their Reasons against the Assemblies allegation of *Act. 15.* for subordi-

nation of Synods. *That Ass. was not a formal Synod but only a reference by the particular Church of Antioch, unto this particular Church of Jerusalem and no other.* But we think Mr. Lockier speaketh the truth that it was a Synod. 2. We must here again note his invidious misrepresenting of our Doctrine. We do not ascribe to that or any other Synod, a power of coercion to enforce their results upon any, but an authoritative juridicall power to enjoin authoritatively their determinations agreeable to the Word of God, and to censure the disobedient and disorderly with meer spirituall censures, as admonition, Excommunication, which import no enforcing, or propriety of speech. Nor do we say, that, that or any other Synod hath power thus authoritatively, to enjoin their determinations, *upon other Churches*, we say they have this power only in relation to these Churches associated in the Synod and none other. So not that which Mr. Lockier sayeth, but this is the other thing to be brought in to make the Presbytery we speak for (what ever it be that he Disputes against, which oftentimes is his own fiction) an juridicall power authoritatively enjoining its determinations, and which may censure with spirituall Ecclesiastick censures the disobeyers and disorderly. And this, we doubt not, will be found in this place, *Act. 15.*

S. II. After this the Author pretending to be clear and full in answering this place, he premitteeth two things, which Reverend Hooker hath also, *Survey, Part. 4. c. 1. 13.* That the Apostles who they were extraordinary Officers, yet in this meeting they did not act as such, because they joined with them ordinary Churches (what ordinary Churches is contradistinguished unto, I know not well) and Officers, and all Disputed, and enquired. And so here was left a samplar to all succeeding generations. In this we agree with him. Only by the way we note, that we see not why he should have said before, Sect. 25. that in the ordination of Deacons the Apostles acted as extraordinary persons, seeing there also they joined the Church with them, in the election of the persons to be ordained. His 2. premise is, that the sentence decreed in that Synod was not Scripture because they decreed it, as still it was when the Apostles moved by the proper Spirit of their Apostolicall Nation, according to that, *2 Pet. 1. 21.* but what they decreed

creed was by debate found out to be either expresse in Scripture or undenyably deduced from thence : So by one of these wayes, was found to be Scripture, and was therefore decreed and injoynd by them upon others. And then goes our a while in clearing this, which we need not insist on. And to passe other things that might be noted in this second premisse granting both, what would he infer hereupon? That in the close of Sect. 28. *So that what they produced by debate was materially binding forasmuch as what they produced was, for the matter of it, no other but the will of God, but not formally as the result of such a Collegiat Eldership.* *Ans.* This last followeth not upon any thing in the former premises. For tho their decrees were not Scripture because decreed by them, but decreed by them because found to be Scripture, or agreeable to generall rules of Scripture, and therefore injoynd by them to the Churches: It followes indeed that their *primary* and *fundamental* obligatorinesse, is materiall : And were they not such, they could not formally, as decrees of the Synod, be obligatory or binding : But it doth not follow that, *simpliciter* they are not binding formally, as decrees of the Synod. The obligatorinesse of decrees of a Synod formally as decrees of a Synod is *secondary*, *subordinate*, and *regulate*, but for that, it is not no obligatorinesse at all. Yea one of his own contradicts him *in terminis*, in this. Mr. Cotton speaking of the decrees, of this very Synod: *Keyes, s. 6. this binding power is not only materially from the weight of the matters imposed (which are necessary, necessitate præcepti from the word) but also formally from the Authority of the Synod.*

But come we to his cleare *Ans.* he brings it in by way of reply to an Object. *Had then this Synod no authoritative power at all? For what end then is the Ordinance?* This indeed is a pertinent Question propounded by the Author to himself. And if he, asserting, as but in his immediatly preceeding words he has done, that the decrees of this Synod, were binding only *materially*, as matters revealed in the Scripture, and not *formally*, can withall Answer this Question affirmatively that this Synod had an authoritative power as such an Ordinance, as a Synod; *Erit mihi magnus Apollo*, nay, I shall say Mr. Lockier can make contradictories agree well enough. See we then his *Ans.* to this. *A forraign Eldership*

6. 12.

Ship rightly constituted hath particular authority, (1.) a power of pre eminent and prevailing counsel, though not a power of jurisdiction to constrain their results to be practised, or to censure Ecclesiastically in case persons, who have the result of things produced by them, do not follow them. They have as an Ordinance of God; a power of pre eminent and prevailing counsel: That is, their result ought to be preferred and prevail more upon our hearts, then what Interpretation other single persons, and ordinary helps, ordinarily afford. *Answ.* First here ere I come to the main bulinesse, note shortly some few things. 1. We never attributed authority to a forrain Eldership, over any persons or Churches. Mr. Lockier here saying that a forrain Eldership hath peculiar authority (if his meaning be according to his words. if he understand authority indeed) that is an Eldership extrinsecall to Churches, yet hath peculiar authority over them, goeth farther then ever Presbyterians did, and indeed goeth clearly contrary to truth, and in terms, speaketh very like the Prelatick way, which attributed to a forrain Eldership, the Prelate and his Cathedrall, authority over all the Churches in the Diocese. But indeed his words and his sense agree not. For his peculiar authority, is no authority, as we shall see anon. 2. We say yet it is but an odious feigned description of that power of jurisdiction, we attribute to Synods and other associated Presbyteries, when it is called a power to constrain their results to be practised, as we have discovered it before. 3. It is yet a grosser misrepresentation, that we attribute unto such Presbyteries a power to censure persons Ecclesiastically in case they have the result of things produced by them and do not follow them. Did ever any Presbyterian say such a thing as this, that a Synod or Presbytery has power to censure persons who have their results by them and does not follow them. For example, that a Synod in Scotland hath power to censure persons, in England or France, that have their results by them and does not follow them, or that any Presbytery hath power to censure persons of the Church within the bounds of their association, who, may be, have their results by them and not follow them? If this has been said out of a mistake and ignorance we pity it, and wishes the Author to know our Doctrine better, ere he take upon him to represent it to others.

If it has been of purpose to render our Doctrine odious, let his own conscience judge what sort of dealing this is.

But to come to the purpose in hand, Mr. *Lockiers* clear and plain answer, at last to this place of *Act. 15. 28.* is that that Synod exercised no power of jurisdiction, but a power of counsell or advice only; He calls it indeed a *peculiar authority*. But when he makes it to be but counsell, that is to give it a bare name, for credits sake; And to deny it the thing of that name. Counsell or advice is but an act of charity, and (if good) of wisdom and prudence, and not of authority. 'Tis no other act but that which one man may do to a Church, one brother to another, one woman to another, yea as Mr. *Rutherford* saith, *Abigail* to *David*, a maid to *Naaman*. That the Author saith it is a power of preheminent and prevailing counsell, that it ought to prevail more upon our hearts than the interpretation of single persons and ordinary helps, availeth not: For preheminent counsell is still but counsell, and so that which is attributed to the Synod differeth no wayes from that which is competent to any single persons to do, or one sister and equall Church to another, but only gradually. And suppose a company of Christians, Pastors or others met together, not Synodically, being persons of known piety and understanding in matters of Religion, their counsell would be such a preheminent and prevailing counsell, that it ought to be preferred and prevail more with our hearts then the interpretation of single persons. So hereby there is no peculiar authority, or power granted to that Synod, as such an Ordinance of God. If yet it shall be said that their counsell is preheminent and prevailing, ought to prevail more upon our hearts, &c. not only upon this ground, that they are many, pious and understanding men, and liker to find out the minde of God in his Word then single persons: But also because they are such an institute meeting, a Synod. To this, I cannot see how Mr. *Lockier* can say this, having but now told us that the decrees of the Synod bind materially, as being the will of God, but not formally, as the result of the Presbytery. For what else is it to say, that their resules ought to prevail more upon our hearts, because the result of such men as a Synod, but that they are binding formally as the results of the Synod. 2. If there be a prehemincy or power

power of prevailing in the decree of a Synod, so that there is an obligation upon our hearts to be more prevailed with, over and above that prebeminency and power of prevailing which is in the counsell of a company of pious and understanding men, met occasionally not in a Synod, (which certainly ought to be preferred and to prevail more with our hearts then the interpretation of single persons) I would ask what is that different power, if it be not a juridicall power : and consequently of censure upon disobedience ? For if it shall be said it is not juridicall power, but only dogmaticall or doctrinall, then I say this is competent to every single Pastor : For a truth of the Gospel taught and delivered by a single Pastor, ought to be beleaved and obeyed, *i. e.* bindeth to obedience and faith, not only because it is Gospel, but because it is doctrinall taught by a Minister, and so that prebeminent and prevailing power shall differ from the power of a single Pastor, but only gradually, and is the very same in kinde, and so no peculiar authority or power of a Synod, as such an Ordinance of God. But now whereas Mr. *Lockier* asserteth that this Synod at *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 15. had not, nor did exercise a juridicall power, but only a power of counsell or advice : We assert the contrair, which is abundantly proven by sundry learned Writers treating upon this subject, and maintained against all Objections made to the contrair by Opposites : We refer the Reader for satisfaction, to these, namely, Mr. *Gillespy* *Assert. of the Govern. of the Church of Scotl. Part. 2. c. 8.* *Aarons Rod, Book 2. c. 9. Arg. 21.* *Papers of the Assen. of Divines. Anf. to the Reas. of the Dissenting Brethren against the instance of the Church of Jerus. Jus Divin. of Church Govern. by the London Ministers, Part. 2. c. 14.* Mr. *Rutherford* *due Right of Presbyteries, pag. 355.* At length treating upon this place. *Spanhem. Epist. ad David Bucan. class. 3. rat. 3.* There is so much said by these to this purpose, that I need not increase the bulk of this Book by setting down any Reasons here against Mr. *Lockier*, if he will be pleased to take unto his consideration what is already said by them, he may do well. Come we to his Reasons brought to prove that this Synod exercised only a power of counsell, not of jurisdiction. Of four brought by Mr. *Hooker, Survey Part. 4. c. 2. pag. 13, 14.* he borroweth two.

1. Is made up of two procesſes, the firſt whereof is this. *Theſe decrees are ſaid to bind theſe to whom they are ſent: But they were ſent to all the Churches of the Gentiles.* This is evident ſaith Mr. *Lockier*, *Acts* 21. 25. *touching the Gentiles that believe, we have written and concluded that they obſerve, &c.* Ergo, *they did bind all the Churches of the Gentiles.* Anſw. To this 1. for the Major, where is it ſo ſaid? I cannot remember any place of the ſtory where this is ſaid. If he and *Hooker*, from whom he hath this, mean, that we ſay and confeſſe this, that the decrees of the Synod bind all theſe to whom they are ſent, that we never ſaid; If it be underſtood of binding as Synodical decrees. A Synod in one Nation may ſend their decrees unto Churches of another Nation (as was ordinary to do in the Primitive times) yet we ſay not, that the decrees of a Synod of one Nation, binds the Churches in another Nation, though, may be, the mater of them binds them. 2. For the minor: If the meaning be, (as it muſt be, that the Argument may ſpeak to the purpoſe it is intended for) that they were ſent by way of Synodical decrees to all the Churches of the Gentiles (as certainly they were to ſome) we deny it, the place cited, *Act*. 21. 25. proves it not: For it ſpeaks of the Gentiles indefinitely, and clearly relates, to the Letter written, *Act*. 15. where the very inſcription bears, that ſo they were ſent only to the Gentiles in *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia* v. 23. 'Tis true *Paul* and *Barnabas* delivered the decrees to others as they went through the cities, *Act*. 16. 4. but it is not ſaid that they were ſent to them by way of Synodical decrees, as they were to theſe other Churches. But grant that one way or other, they were ſent alſo to the reſt of the Churches of the Gentiles, that is, that it was the will and intention of the Synod, that as occaſion ſhould ſerve they ſhould be delivered to them, and we ſhall alſo grant the concluſion of this firſt proceſſe in ſome ſenſe, that they did bind all the Churches of the Gentiles. See we what Mr. *Lockier* will infer upon this in his next proceſſe.

Now theſe (ſaith he) (i.) *all the Churches of the Gentiles had no Commiſſioners delegated to that Synod: Therefore what the Synod did could not bind them by way of authoritative jurisdiction, becauſe where is no delegation of Commiſſioners there is no*

§. 12

right

rights of jurisdiction; They did bind them only by way of counsell and materially, as things clearly held forth in the Word of God.
Ans. If Mr. Lockier when he sayeth, now these had no Commissioners there, &c. if he mean this Universally, that none of the Churches of the Gentiles had Commissioners there, it is clearly false. If he mean only that some of them had no Commissioners there, it is true, and we grant that the decrees of the Synod did not bind these Churches by way of jurisdiction and formally as decrees of the Synod, but materially. But hence it followeth not that they did not bind at all, nor any, by way of jurisdiction. For some Gentile Churches had their Commissioners there, and were Members of the Synod, *Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia*, (these two last, if they had not, yet they might and ought to have had, and it is most probable they had) and so these Churches might be bound by them by way of jurisdiction and formally, for ought that is brought in this Argument, and they did so bind them as is abundantly proven in the Authors cited before.

S. 16.

I cannot here passe by the Observation of the two Sylogistic moulds, whereinto *Hooker* casts this last proceffe, that Mr. Lockier has borrowed from him, in the place of his Survey last cited. The 1. is this. *The decrees of a Synod bind only such by Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, who delegate messengers to the Synod: But the decrees of this Synod bind more then these who delegated messengers to it, to wit, all the Churches of the Gentiles. Therefore it did not intend to bind by Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction.* Truly 'tis a pity to see a Godly man beguiling himself in such maters, with such illogical fillie Arguments. I will not stay to exaggerate this to the full, who sees not the grosse peccancy of this: And if the Author would have concluded formally and right upon his premises, the conclusion should have been this: Therefore the decrees of this Synod did bind more Churches then such as it did bind by Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction. And this he shall have granted by us without contradiction, but also without any advantage to his cause. His second mould (which he sayeth is more plain) is this. *These who send the decrees of the Synod to such Churches who never sent their Commissioners thither; They send only by way of counsell. But this Synod sent their decrees to all the Churches of the Gentiles*

[illegible]

made
nod of
the Sy
before

[illegible]

§. 2. When an upstart, &c. no. 28. That there were many
 eers belonging to this Church of *Ephesus*, herein we join
 him; and there is manifest here but one flock, on this
 point, as to the word one flock. But that it was *one flock*
 or congregation only, as *one* men, we utterly deny, and
 affirm it was an affluite flock or Church, made up of several
 particular

and satisfaction herein were
to the Dissenting Bre-
thren of the Church of Eng^l. And
the Lord's exceeding con-
siderable Answer being gi-
ven, it could bee alledged by these
that there was not any, but one
without any way to infringe
these. And the Answer was but
one.

captivaⁿ Ag^o Ob^o
Ag^o Ob^o
Ob^o

the small one in the world
the small one in the world

from the
the small one in the world

the small one in the world
the small one in the world

the small one in the world
the small one in the world

the small one in the world
the small one in the world

SPECTR

[illegible]

THE

1990

SECRET

by which of the following is the most likely to be
indicated in the

4.

For the purpose of the following, the following is the
most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

the following is the most likely to be indicated in the

are matters of external order and policy, which are determinable by the true light of nature, right reason, and general Rules in the Scripture, about which is exerted that power which is called Dictateck; there are also tryalls and ordinations of Ministers. Now I do not think that Mr. *Lockier* will take it upon him to averre, that the Elders of a single Congregation are like in reason to be more learned, and so more advantaged to judge in matters of this kind, then all the able choise men, Ministers, and Elders from many Congregations assembled together in a Synod, or in a Lawfull Presbytery. 2. He insinuateth also this supposition, that in businesses of Discipline about particular persons there is no other matter to be cognosed and determined, but Questions of *meer fact*. For, he speaks of such matters as are known and discerned by senses, and whereof men are eye-witnesses. This is another mistake. For often times in such businesses are involved intricat Questions of Law or (*Juris*) as frequent experiences in the exercises and processes of Discipline, prove daily. As, suppose the physickall being or doing of an act alledged upon a person, as scandall, be found proven, for example, that he has eaten Swines flesh before a weak beleieving Jew: Yet there may be this Question of Law whether such an act so circumstantiat, be under the kind of a scandall: Upon resolution of which doth depend the convicting of a person guilty of a scandalous fact. And again, suppose a person be found unquestionably guilty of a scandalous fact, yet there may be Question of the demerit and weight of it in relation to censure: Now altho it be true, that the Presbytery of a particular Congregation is like to be more Learned, as to matters of meer fact in businesses of particular members; Yet it can hardly be said in reason, that 'tis like they will be more learned in Questions of Law involved therein, then many choise able men from many Congregations. 3. He insinuateth also a supposition that the Eldership of a Congregation being more learned or understanding in the business of their members (which yet can reasonably be supposed only for matters of fact) that there can be no other ground of conveniency and expediency to bring their matters to be judged by a more ample Eldership over more Congregations: Which also is false: Whereas a Classickal Presbytery or Synod is not like in judging to be so liable to per-

sonall prejudice against the accused, nor so likely to be swayed with fear or favour, or minister respects. And as for the learning and knowledge that the Elders of the particular Congregation have or may have in the businesse of their members, more then other Elders, must not all that by them be communicate to a Classick Presbytery and Synod, themselves being included in it as a part? 4. I add but this, suppose the Elderthip of a Congregation may be more learned in the businesses of their members, yet I suppose (that which is not usuall to fall out) there may be differences among the Elders, or between the Elders and the people (who, according to Mr. Lockier, may have as much hand and more in the jurisdiction, as the Elders) or both may be divided in their judgments, that nothing can be concluded amongst them: What will you have done in such a case? By all these may sufficiently appear the weaknesse of his first ground to prove that associat Elderthips of more Congregations destroye and elude the end of Church power and Jurisdiction. Come we to the second.

His prefaces to it with a big word, as if some great matter were to be brought forth, *'tis good to enquire wisely into this matter, as Solom. saith, what is an institution of God into such an end.* Who would not look for some great matter here; Let's see then the product of this wise enquire. *If the power at home in the particular Congregation be the institution of God for its own affairs, this shall discern better, and judge better, and heal better, then all the Learned Assemblies in world, which people little looks after, whilst this great noise is made with men of so great parts and worth, which sojourning Presbyteries assemble withall. Parturient monies, &c.* *Ans.* If this reason have any force, it also militates as well against all Synods, even consultatory as well as juridicall. It shall follow, it was a wrong course they of Antioch took, to carry their controversie to the Synod of Jerusalem. Why? By Mr. Lockiers theologicall reasoning here, the power at home in the particular Congregation of Antioch (if it was a particular Congregation, as these of our Authors mind may suppose it to have been) being an institution of God for its own affairs, it could discern better, judge better, and heal better their controversie then all the learned Assemblies in the world, and so then that at
Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, &c. 2. But what if the matter to be discerned, judged and healed be not the particular Congregations ones (i.) proper affairs; but common, equally concerning other Congregations also. 3. But the grand, and I may say too, grosse sophisme here is a clear *petitio Quasiti*, a begging of the thing maine in Question, that only the Judicature of a particular Congregation is of Divine institution, and an associate Presbytery Classicall or Synodicall is not of Divine institution, unlesse this be supposed, the consequence is null. One Ordinance instituted of God for one end doth not make void and uselesse, another Ordinance instituted for that same end: But we say that an associate Presbytery of more Congregations is instituted of God, as well as that of a particular Congregation. The contrary of this, Mr. Lockier should have proven, and not barely supposed, and upon that supposition alledged that the power in the particular Congregation being instituted of God, shall do better then any Presbytery of that kind.

Thirdy (saith he) in the nature of the the thing, "is a course which casteth those which subject to it upon a multiplication of appeals, and references forth and back from the Session to the Synod, &c. and whether this looks like Scripture Ordinance, or like the thing it pretends to, an effectuall removall of burden and offences, whilst it thus hurryes poor people up and down, let Christians judge: This is ne quid detrimenti capiant capita Ecclesie: — it may be, the cryes of this and such like, is come up into the ears of the Lord, and ah alas, that good men should be deaf. Answ. 1. This reason what ever it sayeth, sayeth nothing against the being of Presbyteries over more particular Congregations, the unlawfulnessse of which is the thing Mr. Lockier in his Assertion undertooke to prove, but against the subordination of the lesser Presbyteries unto the greater. 2. Neither sayeth it any thing to purpose against this point: But in effect, is rather a cavillation then solide reasoning. The subordination of lesser Presbyteries unto greater, as of Congregationall to Classicall, of both to Synodicall; Presbyteries, in the nature of the thing casteth not persons upon needlesse multiplication of appeals, nor Judicators upon needlesse multiplication of references. But provides

a course for relief of persons, when they are, or may be probably, wronged by the sentence of a lesser Presbytery, by appeal to the cognition and judgement of a greater: And an help to lesser Presbyteries, by having recourse by reference to the judgement and authority of a greater; When such help is needfull for them, as when there are difficultie in their affairs, either through darkness or mightinesse of the matter, or through differences or divisions amongst themselves, or through power and prevalency of persons with whom they have to do in the exercise of their authority: And if this be not more agreeable to Scripture, and a way more likely to remove offences out of the Church of Christ, then to put such an Independent power in the hands of a single Congregation (may be, of 50. or, 40. or, 20. or fewer persons) that if they shall Excommunicat a person, and so deprive him of the fellowship of all Churches in the World, or determine, maintain, and teach Idolatrie, and grossest Heresie; There shall be no power on earth in an Ecclesiasticall authoritative way, to cognosce upon and redresse what they do amisse; Let all Christians judge. But that way of subordination of lesser Presbyteries to greater, and of appeals is very agreeable unto, and warranted by the Scriptures of God, has been sufficiently demonstrated, and vindicated against all the exceptions of opposers by sundry Learned Writers.

See Mr. Gillespie's Answer of the Govern. of the Church of Scotland, Assemblies Divine.

that we need not insist more on it, till we hear more from Mr. Loc-
kier then is said against it here. As to that, this is *ne quid detri-*
menti, &c. we say plainly 'tis but slandering, not reasoning. We
acknowledge no *capita Ecclesia*, but one head, Jesus Christ, and
that all his Ministers, are *pari consortio praeclari & honoris & pote-*
statis. And I beseech you Sr. what is the emolument, that any
Ministers may reap by the subordination of lesser Assemblies or
Presbyteries unto greater, in regard of which they might be said
to receive detriment, if the Government were otherwayes, to wit,
Independent in single Congregations? Indeed if they should look
to their temporary emolument, they might see much reason to
imbrace the Independent way, as that which were the fittest
means *iniquid detrimenti caperent*, as any body may easily dis-
cern, and I conceive some knowes well enough by experience.
As so that which is spoken in the end of this Sect. against this way
of

of Ecclesiastick Government allowing appeals from lesser Presbyteries to greater, as raising cryes that have come up into the ears of the LORD, we shall say no more but this, if any man, at any time, or any where, in managing that Government, have intangled and perplexed persons rather then extricated and eased their distresse, and thereby raised cryes into the ears of the LORD, by oppression of persons, that is nothing against the thing it self. Sinfull men will abuse even the best of Divine institutions, and may be, there are not wanting cryes coming up to the ears of the LORD by oppression of persons in managing of the Independent power of Congregations: Sure I am, it is more apt an hundred fold to cause such cryes. 'Tis a remarkable Story Mr. *Candlish* hath to this purpose, in his Epistle before his *Vindict. Vindicia* in the fourth instance of mischievous consequences of the Independent way, I need not transcribe it, but refers the Reader to the place: But now seeing Mr. *Lockier* directeth this bitter charge against the thing it self in its own nature (so he propounds in the beginning of his third Reason) we shall comfort our selves in this, that it is no new thing and ought not to seem strange to us, that sin is imputed to the truth and pure Ordinances of God, by adversaries, and Gods anger alledged to be drawn on by cleaving to the same. We remember how *Hazekiah* was upbraided upon this account, *Is-37.7.10.*

SECTION XI.

Examination of Mr. Lockiers 4.th Medium, pursued from his SECTION 40, to 47.

His fourth Medium is, that a particular Congregation is compleat and sufficient in it self without an associate Presbtery over more Congregations; Whereby he intends to prove such Presbyteries uselesse and a device of man and no divine institution, because God would not appoint uselesse things. His Argument fully set up is this: If every particular Congregation rightly constituted and compleated hath sufficiencie within it self to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ, to Ordaine, to Excommunicate with-
out

S. 1.

out

out the larger Eldershups, then larger Eldershups are uselesse; But every particular Congregation rightly constitute and compleat hath sufficiencie within it self, &c. Therefore, &c. *Ans.* Ere I reply particularly, first we would understand, what the Author doeth understand by the compleatnesse of a particular Congregation, and what may be understood, by having sufficiencie within it self to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ: for the former, I conceive the Author meaneth a particular Congregation to be compleat in its constitution, when as beside the body of private Professours, there is in it an Eldership made up of all the integrall parts thereof, Pastours, or one Pastour, Teachers, or one Teacher at least. and some competent number of Ruling Elders, three at least, so many Officers, according to our Brethren, make up a compleat Eldership for a Congregation. For the other we would consider, that by sufficiencie to exercise the Ordinances of Christ, we must understand not only a competencie of gifts and abilities of wisdom and understanding for exercising such and such acts; But also, power and authority by a divine warrant, institution and call. A private gifted man may have the competencie of gifts for Preaching the Gospel, Administration of Sacraments; yet he hath not simply sufficiencie to exercise that Ordinance, because he hath not power and authority by calling from God to do it: These premised, for *Ans.* 1. The major Proposition is a grosse *non-sequitur*, and injurious to the wisdom of God in his Ordinances: for there may be for a certain end a mean appointed of God, which is by it self sufficient for effecting that end simply, and another mean appointed of God for that same end, and yet this is not uselesse because the other is sufficient; Because this may be for the better, more easie, more safe effecting of it. Manifold instances might be given of this, the promise of salvation or of the blessing of Believers, is of and by it self sufficient enough to give assurance to the Children of God of the immutability of Gods counsell and purpose of their salvation: Was therefore the oath added to the word of promise uselesse. God forbid it should be said, it is added of superabundant good will that we might have the more abundant assurance and consolation, *Heb. 6. 17. 18.* So the Preaching of the Gospel is of it self a mean sufficient of faith and salvation: Are therefore the Sacraments,

Sacraments, and Discipline, uselesse? God appointed, in his Church, means for his spirituall works therein, not only sufficient but abundant, not only for their *esse simpliciter*, but also for their *bens esse*, yea for their *opimum esse*. So that although a particular Congregation have sufficiencie to exercise all these Ordinances of Christ, yet larger Elderships of more Congregations associated together, may be of much and singular good use, for the better, or best performance or exercising of them, for exercising them with lesse danger of erring and miscarrying; with the more authority, and to the begetting of the more reverence, respect and obedience in people. So Mr. Lockiers major which he neglects to prove, but suppoeth as if it were, without Question, is rotten and false, and consequently the whole frame of his Argument by this falls to the ground, so that we need not insilt upon the minor or assumption: But 2. here I would ask Mr. Lockier, What if a particular Congregation be not compleat, have not an entire Eldership of its own, I suppose, Pastour and Teacher be removed, the Ruling Elders only remaining, or all of them being removed, in this case whether has the particular Congregation sufficiencie in it self to exercise these ordinances, to Ordain, to Excommunicate? If he Answer yes, as it is most absurd and contrary to the Scriptures of God to make a Church exercising the publike Ordinances of Christ without the Officers and Ministers of Christ: So, if so, what needd him propound the Argument of a Congregation compleat? If he Answer no; May not a Classicall Presbytery be of use here? Else how shall their ordinances be exercised to them? For certainly there will be a necessity of exercising some of them, of Ordination at least. But see the minor also,

A particular Congregation rightly constituted and compleated S. 2.
 (as was expounded before, having with the body of Professors a Pastor, Teacher, and a competent number of Ruling Elders, three may be the number, *have sufficiency in it self to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ, to Ordain, to Excommunicate, by it self, without forraign*, we say, larger associated Presbyteries. *Ans. 1.* We conceive that a particular Congregation may be compleat in Mr. Lockiers sense, i. e. having an Eldership intier in all parts thereof, such as is an Eldership consisting of one Pastor, one Teacher,

cher,

cher, and three young Elders, five in all, who, maybe, have not sufficiency of abilities, as is requisite for due and safe exercising these Ordinances, of Ordination and Excommunication. But 2. Suppose they had competency of gifts for managing the exercises of these Ordinances: yet we say they have not sufficiency in themselves to exercise them without an associate Presbytery where they may conveniently associate, because they have not authority and warrant from God in his Word to do it. I say, *where they may conveniently associate*: For we deny not but a particular Congregation, being in such a case that it cannot enjoy association with other Churches, through a physicall impossibility or impediment, in this case of necessity, may, as it is alone, exercise such acts of Government: but particular Congregations, where they can conveniently associate together, they are obliged by the rule and warrant of Gods Word, to associate under common Presbyteries, Classieall and Synodieall: and in this case, that a particular Congregation ought not, nor may, by warrant of Gods Word, exercise these acts of Government of publike and common concernment, as Ordination and Deposition of Ministers, Excommunication of persons, by it self alone: But these acts ought to be done by the common Presbytery Classieall or Synodicall. And that a particular Congregation ought not, nor may not, by warrant of Gods Word, perform any act in maters particularly concerning themselves, so without the common Presbytery of the association, but that there should be liberty of appeal to the common Presbytery: And that the common Presbytery may juridically and authoritatively cognosce, and judge upon their proceedings and actions: In a word, it may do things of Government particularly belonging to it self in and by it self, but with subordination, to the larger and common Presbyteries, these things have been abundantly proven by sundry learned men, as Mr. Gillesp. in his *Assert. of the Government*, &c. Mr. Rutherford. *Gull Apollon*. in his *consideration of sundry controversies*. *In Divin*. The *Ass. of Divines*, come we to see what Mr. Lockier bringeth for the contrair.

- §.3. First, *It is granted by our Brethren (sayeth he) that such a Church hath this sufficiency in the exercise of some Ordinances, as Preaching,*

Preaching, Administration of Sacraments, without seeking the consent or help of the Classis: Nor were the Church to neglect these. Whence he concludeth that it may also exercise the other, Ordination and Excommunication. And gives for a proof of the consequence upon that grant. If they may do the greater surely they may do the lesser, and there is no dispensation of so chiefe an excellency as Preaching, as Paul witnesseth, making it the chief part of his errand. I was sent to Preach the Gospel, not to Baptize.

Ans. 1. 'Tis true, we grant that such a Church, i. e. a particular Congregation having all its Officers hath sufficiency in it to exercise these Ordinances of Preaching and Administration of Sacraments. i. e. the Pastors of a particular Congregation may Preach the Word, and Administer the Sacraments without speciall consent or help and concurrence, of the Classicall Presbytery to every act, nor were he to neglect or cease from these, if the Classis should forbid, I mean without just cause; Yet it may be, and it is so indeed by the warrant of Gods Word, that the particular Congregation cannot have, in the ordinary way of the Church in a settled and constitute state, the Pastor to exercise these Ordinances but by the consent and potestative mission and Ordination of the Classis, or some associate Presbyterie, and tho the Pastor of the particular Congregation his exercising these Ordinances be not dependent upon the actuall concurrence in the severall individuall acts; Yet therein he is subordinate to their Ministeriall Authority, to try and judge his Preaching according to the Word of God, and, if they find just cause, may forbid him to preach, and they forbidding, he must obey. But 2. Its a grosse *non-sequitur*, a particular Church, or the Pastors in a particular Church, have sufficiency or power to preach the Gospel, and administer Sacraments, without the help or concurrence of the Classicall Presbyterie. *Ergo* they may also exercise these other Ordinances, Ordination and Excommunication, without their concurrence; And the proof of it is invalide, because that is greater, and if they may do the greater alone by themselves, they may also do the lesser: For by that same reason it should follow, A Pastor hath sufficiency and power by himself alone to preach the Gospel, to Baptize without the help and concurrence of his fellow-Elders in the Congregation.

Ergo he may also by himself alone Ordain and Excommunicate, without their help and concurrence. Why? That is the greater; and if he may do the greater alone, he may also do the lesser. The Author himself will not, I conceive, admit the Consequence here. The truth is, the interest of persons to exercise this, or that, or the other, Ordinance is not to be attended or determined, according to the greater or lesser excellency of the work: But according to Christs commission, institution, and grant of power to them. The exercise of Ecclesiasticall power in some things, (which is commonly called *power of order*) as Preaching of the Word, Administration of Sacraments, is given to Christs Ministers, severally and a part, considered as single Pastors. So a Pastor may preach the Word and administer Sacraments alone, without concurrence, or special consent, either of the whole Church, or other Rulers to every act: But in other things (these of the power, called the *power of jurisdiction*) the exercise and power thereof is not given to one; but to an *unity*: To the community of Governours of the Church united together: not any single Rulers severally. Therefore tho a Pastor may preach, and baptize alone, yet he may not Censure nor Excommunicate alone; And if he should do this, the act were invalide; both in *foro Dei*, and in *foro Ecclesiastico*. Now the power of Ordination and Excommunication being given to a community, the Question is, whether this community be a particular Congregation; having an intire particular Eldership, or the Eldership of a particular Congregation; by it self and independent from a larger Presbyterie, this Mr. Lockier saith; but his Argument, grounded upon our grant, to prove it, is impertinent, as we have seen.

- §. 4. But further he would prove that a particular Congregation hath power to exercise all Ordinances, as well as any, thus; Sect. 41. *The Keyes are not divided: The Keyes are all given to Peter as personating the Church of believers in the Gospel, that Kingdom of which Christ said he would build: And I will give unto [thee] the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever [thou] shalt bind on earth, Mat. 16. 19. Surely this particular here used, is not in vain, but to set forth that every Gospel-Church, every particular Congregation of believers, united as a visible organical*
body,

body, for Gods Worship have ability, a power given to it, as to such an end (he means to exercise all the Keyes, alone and by themselves, which he expresseth thus) they have not a lame commission, part of the Keyes at their girdle, and strangers and forrainers carrying another part. *Answ.* 1. As to that of dividing the Keyes, we have said sufficient before. 2. As to that alledged, the Keyes were all given to *Peter*, as personating the Church of Believers, &c. we have spoken also before in the Examination of his first proof of the first Assertion. Now we adde but these things here. 1. I would ask *Mr. Lockier* what he means by the Church of Believers in the Gospel? Whether the universall Church Visible of Believers? Then he must acknowledge a Church Universall Visible individually one: For certainly the article (*the*) denoteth a certain singular one thing. But this, I doubt, *Mr. Lockier* will grant, A Visible Church Catholick, existing really one. And however: it is not his purpose here, to alledge that *Peter* received the Keyes, as personating the Universall Church Visible. For the thing he would be at and must prove, is, that all the Keyes and exercise thereof are given to every one particular Church or Congregation, singly and within it self. If he say he means a particular Visible Church, I ask which is it, of *Rome*, or *Corinth*, or *Ephesus*? If any one of these definitely, what then becommeth of all the rest? Nay but will he say, not any one particular Visible Church definitely, but indefinitely any and every one. But 1. His words are, that *Peter* in this mater personated the Church Visible, which in propriety of speech, seemeth to me to note a determinate and definite individuall, but passing this. 2. It cannot be a particular Visible Church, whether definitely, or some certain one: or indefinitely for any one; Because, as *Mr. Lockier* himself sayeth, the Church that *Peter* personated is that which Christ saith, *ver. 18. that he would build upon the rock. that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.* But this is not any particular Visible Church, but either the Church Invisible of the elect and redeemed ones, or the Church Visible Catholick; Because any particular Visible Church may be prevailed against. 3. That Assertion, Surely this particular here used (so wit, the Pronoun of the second person twice in the sentence, *thee* and *thou*) is not in vain,

but to set forth that every Gospel Church, &c. is, I may say, an Assertion of such boldnesse without proof, as any man of understanding may wonder, that a modest man should have uttered it, before men that have not sold away their judgments to be slaves to any mans dictates. What? Must our Saviours speaking to *Peter* here, in the singular number, be in vain, unlesse hereby he intended to set out every particular Congregation, and surely it must be so, and we must believe it surely to be so, because Mr. *Lockier* saith it, tho he do no more but say it, *veritas ipsa*, is enough. Is there not another possible Reason to be given of this, that Christ in this giving of the Keyes directs his speech particularly to *Peter*, but this that Mr. *Lockier* deviseth, so that his speaking to *Peter* thus particularly must be in vain, if this Reason be not taken, to make it to purpose? Know we not that long agoe *Cyprian* in his treatise, *de Unitate Ecclesie*, has given another reason of this, which I conceive, any judicious man will think much more purpose-like then Mr. *Lockiers*. *Quamvis* (saith that Ancient of this matter), "*Apostolus omnibus post resurrectionem suam, parem potestatem tribuit — tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit, hoc erant atq; ceteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio pradii & honoris & potestatis: Sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut Ecclesia una monstretur.*" His meaning is, that Christ at first spake singularly to *Peter* in giving the Keyes, that he might set forth the unity of the Church spread throughout the whole World. We know also that our learned Countrey-man *Camers* in his *pralect.* on the place, gives yet another Reason of Christs thus speaking to *Peter* singularly, which he very probably confirmeth by sundry circumstances in the Text, and severall other considerations from other places, which I need not insert here, but refers the Reader to the Author himself. Yea, I see not reason why it should be thought that Christs speaking to *Peter* in the Singular Number, should be thought to be in vain unlesse some mysticall signification had been intended thereby. Christ having asked a Question of the Apostles in common, and *Peter* one for all the rest having made the answer, might not Christ in his reply upon the answer, speak singularly to *Peter* without intending

intending any mysticall signification thereby, but his speaking in such a way behoved to be in vain? I confesse I see not this. 4. Mr. Lockier saith here in this Assertion that, *this particular is used, i.e. Peter is particularly spoken to, to set forth that every particular Congregation of believers united in a visible organical body for Gods worship; &c.* which is as much as to say that Peter in receiving the Keyes personated every particular Congregation united as a visible organical body. But then, 1. How consisteth this with that which he asserted upon the first Ass. Sect. 2. That the Keyes were given at first to Peter not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, and that, in him the Keyes were given to a Church of believers, as believing primarily; and to the Elders, in the second place as exerted out of that state, and as servants of it. Here they are given to Peter as personating a Congregation of believers united as an organical body and so as personating both simple beleivers and Elders: There they are given to Peter not as an Elder, nor representing Elders, but as a believer and personating beleivers as beleiving. 2. If Peter in receiving the Keyes personated, a Congregation of beleivers, united as an organical body for Gods Worship, that is, as now constituted, of people and Officers; Then who must exercise the Keyes, in relation to a Congregation, wanting its own organs, Ministers and Elders? Go we on.

And for the Key of Excommunication (saith he) which is so much denied to the particular Congregation, the Church of Corinth, is blamed by the Apostle, that they did not this of themselves without him, and his urging of them, much more without a Collegial Church sentence. *Ans.* True, the Church of Corinth is blamed that they did not this of themselves: But that the Church of Corinth was but an single Congregation, and not a Presbyteriall Church, composed of several particular Congregations, under one Presbyteriall Government, should been proven, and not barely alledged, or supposed. See the contrary proven by Mr. Rutherford, *Dut Right*. pag. 460. & seq. the Authors of *Jus Divin*. pag. 26. & seq. upon these grounds. 1. The multitude of beleivers. 2. The plenty of Ministers. 3. The diversity of tongues and

S: 5.

and languages. 4. The plurality of Churches mentioned therein:

5. A Presbyteriall meeting of Prophets.

- §.6. He proceeds to reason, by way of removing an Objection, thus. *If it be said they be fit to Preach and Administer seals, but not to Ordain or Excommunicat, because the particular Churches cannot make up a sufficient Eldership.* This is the Objection he frames to himself as if it were ours, on which. 1. We say not they, i. e. the particular Congregation, wholly taken, are fit to Preach, or may Preach: But we say that any one Pastour rightly called is fit to Preach and administer seals, his alone. 2. We say not simply that the Eldership of a particular Congregation may not in any case ordaine, or Excommunicate; But we say that when there are more Congregations, to associate with and when association may be had, they should not performe these acts alone, but in an associate Presbytery. And we make not the principall ground of this, that the Eldership of a particular Congregation, is not sufficient (*viz.* for gifts and ability) for exercising these acts (although there be a ground of necessity of it ordinarily from this; It being seldome that in particular Congregations there will be found Elderships sufficient for managing these matters.) For although the Eldership of a particular Congregation were very sufficient this way, yet we say they ought not to exercise these acts, by themselves without an associate Presbytery, at least they ought not to do by themselves independently, without subordination to larger associate Presbyteries (as Mr. Lockier intends) because the Scripture doeth not warrand, Christ hath not instituted this, but the contrare. Now his reason following, being founded upon this mistake in his Objection, which we have cleared, there is no great need to insist in following it, especially considering it is nothing else, but, the same in very words with the second reason by the Dissenting Brethren to prove the minor of their first reason against the Assemblie of Divines, their Proposition touching Ordination, and you have it fully considered and answered by the Assemblie in their answers, see their Papers pag. 195. 196. might not Mr. Lockier have read their answer, and either spared the presenting us with that reason, anew again, or given it with some new strength against the Assemblies answers to it? *exedit miseros crumbe repetita.* He

He further proceedeth thus. Sect. 44. If one particular Congregation so constituted, as is before mentioned, be not sufficient to exercise the full power of the Keyes, without a forraine (still we must bid you correct your nick naming things, and say an associate Presbytery) then the first Church, to wit, that of Jerusalem, was lame in its power, till others were erected; And Antioch lame in its power, because but one Church in association with it, and answerably they made lame work. And other Congregations which were scattered up & down in Pontus, Cappadocia, &c. which in all likely-hood by distance of place, and by violence of Heathens, were in an utter incapacity, to any standing, associate Elderships, were all lame and could not supplie the mortality of their Ministers and Officers, and so must indeed sink, from a defect intrinsecall, being not able to relieve themselves without a forraine, an associate power. Ans. 1. From that which is said by the men Mr. Lockier disputes against it, to wit, that Elderships of particular Congregations, when they may associate with others have not sufficiencie by divine warrant, to exercise acts of jurisdiction of publike and common concernment, alone, and by themselves, without the concurrence of associate Elderships, much lesse, without subordination to them, doeth not follow, that the Eldership of one single Congregation, when there is but that one existing in the world, (such as he supposeth that of Jerusalem to have been at the first) Or if a single Congregation, when though there be others existing in the Word, yet it is under a Physicall incapacity, by some insuperable impediment, to associate with others (such as he supposeth these Congregations in Pontus, Cappadocia, &c. have been) are so lame and imperfect, that they cannot in that case when necessity requireth, or may not exercise these acts. 'Tis granted in these cases they may. Yet this we say withall, a Congregation in such a condition, though it be not in such a case of absolute imperfection, that it cannot perform necessarie acts of Government for its own preservation, yet it is not in so compleat and perfect a state of Government, as when it may be and is associate with others, for exercise of Government, this is sufficient to this reason. Only 2. there is one or two particulars would be noted. 1. While as he supposeth that the Church of Jerusalem was

was

was but one single Congregation, if he mean all the time till other Churches in other places were erected, the supposition is beside the truth, as has been proven by the Authors we referred to before upon this mater. Yet I doubt much if it shall be proven that at any time when there was a Government in it, that it was but one single Congregation. 2. As to that he sayeth of *Antioch* by that one Church wherewith it was associate, I conceive that he means that of *Jerusalem*, but first how will he prove that it was not associate also with the Churches of *Syria* and *Cilicia*. Sure there is great likelihood that it was, at least in that Synod at *Jerusalem*, considering that the Synodical letter is directed to them and it jointly: again the very Church of *Jerusalem*, at that time at least, was not a single Congregation, but a Presbyteriall Church consisting of more particular Congregations, as the Authors mentioned have proven, and so was *Antioch* too. See *Jus Divin. of Church Govern.* P. 2. c. 13. p. 204. Further, did not Mr. Lock before acknowledge that meeting at *Jerusalem*, to be a Synod, oftner then once, whether it was an association of two Churches or more, this he acknowledged, that it was a Synod, 'tis true he would have it to have been only consultative, and not juridicall: But it sufficeth my purpose in calling to mind his acknowledgment, which is to shew that he doth very impertinently bring in the Church of *Antioch* in this Argument, seeing he confesseth it to have been in such an association as made up a Synod, which is an associate Presbytery superior to a Classicall Presbytery.

§. 8.

To that we said in the Answer to this Reason Mr. Lockier would, it seemeth, say somewhat in the close of this SECT. 44. *To say, that in extraordinary cases, unordinary things may be done, is little to the satisfaction of a tender heart, especially in divine things, who is apt to believe, that God hath so shaped his publick Ordinances, which are enjoined to be used in all places, that places shall not be a standing let to put his people continually to run beside the instituted rule.* To this 1. In extraordinary cases, to do things unordinary, I mean as to the course appointed by a positive law, may be with very good satisfaction to a most tender heart, that is, a well informed and rightly tender heart, and not a superstitious heart: *Have ye not read* (saith our Saviour, *Math. 12. 4.* s.)

5.) *what David did when he was an hungred, and they that were with him, how he entred into the house of God, and did eat the shew-bread, which was not lawfull for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the Priests?* It was an extraordinary thing for David, or any other men, not Priests, to eat the Shew-bread: Yet in that extraordinary case, when David and his company were hungry, and no other bread was to be had, let their hearts be never so tender, if rightly informed, as they did eat, so with good satisfaction they might eat it. And generally what is not ordinarily to be done by a positive law, in an extraordinarie case, when necessity requires, may be done, and a tender heart have good satisfaction in the doing of it, even in things divine. 2. The nature and constitution of Gods Ordinances is not estimat and defined according to what shape, the hearts of men are apt to conceive he has put upon them: but according to what his own word saith of his will concerning them. It was yeelding to this aptitude of mens hearts in conceiving Gods shewing of Ordinances, that baptizing by private persons, and even midwives, did spring from, into the Church of God. 3. The ordinary and expresse rule that we speak of, that single Congregations should not exercise acts of jurisdiction of publick and common concernment, by themselves alone without associat Elderships, relates to the case when association may be had. But when association cannot possibly be had, as if a Congregation be in a remote Island, or divided from all other Churches by some other insuperable impediment of fellowship, we say that in that case of necessity, it is the ordinary rule to that Congregation to act as it is, alone by it self: If it shall be said, seeing when it is that way alone, it may exercise these Ordinances within it self, then if, other Congregations being in a capacitie to be joined with, it may not exercise them alone, it is abridged off the former liberty it had before when it was alone by it self. I answer, this is no abridgement of its liberty, but only a strengthening of their power in things of common concernment; As, suppose there being five Elders in a Congregation, while as they are only these five, they may act in the Government of that Congregation. Yet if other six be added to them, they may not now act without these, yet this is no abridging of any liberty they had, but a strengthening

of their power. The truth is, that a Congregation in an incapacity of association with other Congregations, exerciseth and dispenseth all these Ordinances within it self, not as being one single Congregation, but as being the whole Church. A Congregation in such a case, is as if there were not another Congregation in the world, and that is to be the whole Church *interpretative*. Just as there being in a Congregation five Elders only, these five act all things belonging to Elders in the Congregation, not because they are such a definite competent number, but because they are the whole number; Because if they did act as being such a definite number, they could not admit any more to joyne with them in the work.

- S. 9. Further, it is (saith he) confessed by our Brethren that the Jurisdictions of Classes and Congregations do not differ specifically, but only in extension: Then if they differ only in extension, the intrinsecall power of the Elders of the Congregation, is the same with the Elders of Classes; And when there is no specificall act that the one puts forth, but the other can put forth too, as occasion shall require, can Ordain and Excommunicate as the Collegiat Church, and so is the Congregationall Church complete if the Classicall Church be. *Ans.* 1. Mr. Lockier is not well enough acquainted, it seemeth, with the judgement of all Presbyterians concerning the difference between Congregationall and Classicall Elderships, when as he sayeth that they confesse there is no specificall or formall difference between them, if he were acquainted better with them, he would find some to be of that mind, that tho there be Elders of a single Congregation, yet that there is not a Presbytery of a single Congregation having power, to exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and I confesse it is hard to find any pattern in the Word of God of such a Presbytery. But, 2. When as he sayeth, that in the confession of Presbyterians they differ only in extension, he mistakes the judgement of the most part of all Presbyterians, who, and that indeed according to truth, hold that the power of a Classicall Presbytery, as to the exercise of Government, not only reaches a larger object, i. e. differs in extension, but also more acts of jurisdiction, as Ordination, Excommunication, which the Eldership of a single Congregation, as one single

single Congregation, cannot exercise, and that is to differ *intensive*. But I suppose all were granted which is asked here, that Classicall Presbyteries differ not specifically from Congregationall, that their power of jurisdiction differs only *extensive*, that there is no specificall act exercised by the Classicall, but the Congregationall may exercise in it self, when occasion requires, and so that it is compleat, this way, (which is just such compleatnesse, as we mean when we say that a Boy is a compleat Man) tho all this were granted, does it hereupon follow that larger associate Presbyteries juridicall are uselesse devices of men? No wayes as has been shewed before. Altho it were granted that the Eldership of a particular Congregation may exercise all these specificall acts, there may be many cases, wherein it may be not only expedient, but necessary that the matter be judged and determined by an associate Presbytery, as when it is a matter of great difficultie, when other Congregations are much and nearly, or equally concerned, when there is division and difference in the Congregationall Eldership or Church that the matter cannot be agreed upon and determined amongst themselves, when there is an appeal *propter malam administrationem, vel malam administrationem præsumptam, &c.*

Finally, SECT. 46. If the particular Church had not been compleat to do its own work, without a fortain, an associate Eldership, the Apostles, would have mentioned something of this combining of Elderships. — and when this might have been surely the Church of Christ durst not neglect the use of it: And yet we find not the one, and do find the other, — the Apostle when he took his leave of the Church of Ephesus, commends it not to associate Elders, but both Elders and people as one flock to the grace of God, Act. 20. 32. *Ans.* 1. Let it be so that the particular Church is compleat to do its own work. Yet, 1. Is not every Congregation, as a part of the whole body of the Visible Church of Christ, to look to the work of fellow members, and parts, and of the whole, according to its measure and proportion of power? Should one member say to another, I must see to my own work: Ought I to care for thee? Are there not matters of publick and common concernment? 2. No particular Church is politically so compleat as to do every work of its own in every case, as has been shewed, but it will in

this stand in need of an associat Superiour Eldership. 3. It hath been abundantly proven by the Authors we referred to before, that Scripture is not silent, but often mentioneth the thing of associated Presbyteries, and all exceptions made to the contrary abundantly confuted. 4. What Mr. Lockier has found or not found we know not, nor stands on it, but he might have found a Presbytery over more Congregations then one, in *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, and he cannot deny but he has found the Church of *Antioch* making use of an associate Synodical Presbytery at *Jerusalem*, and that that Presbytery was more then consultative, even authoritative and juridicall has been proven: But I think what ever he conceives that he has found of a Congregational Eldership exercising jurisdiction, Ordaining or Excommunicating by it self, he shall hardly point us to the place of Scripture where he found the instance of it, what he saith of the Elders and Church of *Ephesus* from *Acts* 20. has been answered before.

SECTION XII.

Reply to Mr. Lockiers Answers to some Objections from SECTION 47. to the end, wherein separation from not onely this Church of Scotland, but all the Protestant Presbyterian Churches, as Idolatrous, is driven at.

S. 1.

MR. Lockier having hitherto gone about, as he could, to maintain that the power of the Keyes and Government of the Church of Christ, ought not to be in the hands of Officers and Governours set over the Church in the Lord, by the Lord himself; but in the hands of the whole Church, and that in the hands of every particular Congregation, independently and supremely without association in or subordination unto any common Ecclesiastick Government (which how well he has asserted and maintained, we leave it to all understanding impartiall Readers to give their judgement) he applies himself, to Answer some Objections against the things he has handled, as he sayeth. But what Objections are they I pray? none of those which are brought directly against the points

points maintained by him before this. Likely he found these too hard for him to grapple with, and therefore thought it his wisdom to passe them rather by in silence. And the Objections he brings, are onely some things which he conceived might be said against his designe in casting this Little Stone at Presbyterian Churches, to drive all good Christians, if they might be affrighted, to separation from them. A wicked and thamefull designe, especially for a man professing Godlinesse to have set before him. I mind not here to insult or enlarge my self upon the Question of Separation from Churches, not onely because other learned men have spoken abundantly and well upon that purpose, namely my Reverend and Learned Colleague in the Ministrie, and Superiour in the society wherein I live, Mr. *Rushersford* in his *Peaceable Plea and Due Right*: But also because I find nothing brought by this Author, upon the mater, worth the staying upon, in handling that mater. I shall onely give some few notes upon some things the Author, I think out of heat of passion, hath vented himself in.

Having Sect. 47. objected to himself thus. You seem to be for separation from a Presbyteriall Church. We find no separation but in case of Idolatry. To this Sect. 48. he answers thus in summe. That not only heathens had their idolatry as Dagon, but also Christians theirs, as a supreme Bishop over all Churches, which he insinuateth to have been the Papists Idolatry. Alas! he might have given other instances of their Idolatry then this (as their worshipping a breadden god, Crucifixes, Relicks, Saints departed, Images, &c.) then a supreme Bishop, or Archbishop over the Church in such a Nation (the Prelaticall Protestants Idol he would say) and then a combination of Bishops over Churches (hereby meaning an associat Presbyterie or Assembly Presbyteers Ruling more Churches, odiously calling them Bishops) that to him is also Idolatry. So, that command 2 Cor. 6. 17. come out from one kind of Idolatry, is come out from all; Or else that rule binds only to separate from Heathnish Idolatry. What is not warranted by the Word is an Idol — *Ans.* We shall not deny but that whatsoever is practized in the Worship of God, or set up as an Ordinance without Gods warrand in his Word, may be comprehended under Idolatry taking Idolatry in a large sense; but that every thing set up or practized

S. 2.

Practized in the Worship of God, or in Ordinances, is such Idolatry as is a ground sufficient to separate from a Church wherein it is practized, as no true Church, is a conceit in it self without warrant of the Word, nay directly contrary to the allowed practise of Gods people in the Word, both in Old and New Testament. This conceit of Mr. Lockiers, is very Brounisme and rigide Separatisme ingraine. But of this and the place 2 Cor. 6. 17. see enough in the Reverend Author whom I last mentioned. But as for association or combination of Churches, under a common Presbyterie, it is warranted in the Word of God, and so is his Ordinance, as has been abundantly proven, and what Mr. Lockier has brought to the contrary, we trust has been sufficiently refuted. And therefore let him consider, his account he has to make to Almighty God, for so atrocious a calumnie as his branding it with the name of Idolatry, and involving all the Reformed Orthodox Churches of Jesus Christ in the fearfull crime of Idolatry. And as for his pressing separation from all the Reformed Churches as Idolatrous, I shall say no more, but bring some Godly men amongst Independents themselves giving testimony against him. Hear Mr. Hooker, speaking in the name of the Divines of new England of the Congregations of old England. *I would (sayeth he) intreat the Reader that if he meet with such accusations, that we nullifie all Churches beside our own — that we are rigide Separatists, &c. such bitter calumnies, a wise meek spirit passeth by them as an unworthy and ungrounded aspersions.* That which that Godly man in name of many other Independent Brethren with him, intreats may not be believed to be thought or said by them, accounteth it an unworthie and groundlesse aspersions, Mr. Lockier with open mouth ownes and proclaimes that and worse: Then we see what the Dissenting Brethren in the Assemblies of Divines say of their keeping communion with Presbyterian Churches, Papers given in to the Honourable Committee, &c. pag. 29, 30. holding communion with neighbour Churches in baptizing our Children (as occasion may fall out in absence of Ministers) in their Churches, by occasional receiving the Communion in their Churches; Also our Ministers to Preach in their Congregations, and receiving theirs also to Preach in ours, as Ministers of the Gospel, as mutually their shall be a call from each

each other; when we have any cases hard and difficult for our selves, to advise with the Elders of their Churches; in case of choise of Elders, to seek the approbation and right hand of fellowship from Godly Ministers of their Churches; and when an Ordination falls out, to desire the presence and approbation of their Elders with our own. In case any of our Churches miscarry through mal-administration, to be willing upon scandall taken by their Churches, to give an account as unto *Sister Churches* offended, and to esteem and account (as we do) a sentence of non-Communion by them, by Churches, against us, upon such scandalls where-in they are not satisfied, an heavy and sad punishment, and to be looked upon, as a means to humble us, and an Ordinance of God to reduce us. If those men, pillars of the Independent way, had accounted, as Mr. *Lockier* does, Presbyterian Churches to be idolatrous, would they have professed to hold & retain such Communion with them? Nay, do they not themselves, alledge all these things, as Arguments to evidence that they are far from the mind of those who accounts them false Churches. *All this (say they) is more, then as if in nothing they were to be complied with, nor their Churches to be communicated with in any thing which should argue Church Communion, more is said and done by those who account them false Churches.*

His second obj. *Seff. 49. Answ. Seff. 50.* is but a fiction set up by himself, that he may seem at least, to gain a victory. We use not to reason so, *many has been converted under Presbyteriall Government, doth not this seal it to be of God.* We know many have been, and doubts not but some are at this day, converted, under Papall Government which is very Antichristianisme. But this, Sr, we tell you, that Presbyteriall Government in the exercise thereof, has been the blessed means under God of converting souls, reducing them from their sinfull wayes to God and his Son Christ Jesus, the terrour of evill doers, the preserver of his Church, the Hedge that has guarded the Vineyard of the Lord from Foxes, the very Hammer of Errours, Heresies and Hereticks, and therefore is so much at this day maligned and hated of all such, that, in these lamentable times, has turned aside unto their loose and erroneous wayes. 'Tis true, Presbyterian takes

S. R.

it

it for no good Argument to prove Episcopall Government to be of God, that many were Converted under it; and believes it was a Government of mans invention: Yet, Presbyterians never thought of Churches under Episcopall Government, in which the truth of the Gospel was Preached, and Sacraments administered according to Christs institution, for their substance, as you think of Presbyterian, that they were false Churches. But something more of this in considering his next Objection and Answer thereunto, which fully unbowels the Authors design against Presbyterian Churches.

Si 4. The Objection he frameth to himself is this: *But many Godly being in the Presbyterian way, is it not more proper to purge then to pull down all: To make use of the root, and not up with root and branch.* To which his Answer in summe is: *that it was just so objected by the Godly in England when the Presbyterians would have down with our Episcopall Church; But it behoved to be up root and branch. So must now the Presbyterian. The Lords controversie has come about to it, and means the same.* And thereupon he gives his plain and faithfull warning to his dear Brethren. Does this man know of what spirit he is? To speak so Edomite-like of all Presbyterian Churches. Down with them, raze them to the ground, up with root and branch of them. *Hoc Ithacum velit & magno mercetur Arida.* I think the man has wished a peece of acceptable service to Antichrist; and his father the Devil. Lord grant him mercy of it. 'Tis none of our pleading for the Presbyterian way, that many godly being in it, therefore simply purging of Presbyterian Churches, were more proper then rooting up and pulling down all. If any man, Sir, has come to reason with you, thus poorly for Presbyterian Churches, we doubt not but ere that time he has dealt treacherously against the truth: We tell you, the Presbyterian way is Gods way instituted in his Word, the contrary whereof you, but beggingly suppose in framing your Objection; but has not, nor ever will prove. Yet this we affirme, that albeit there be in Churches, corruptions, not only in the conversations of many persons, but also in some things in the Worship and Ordinances, yet if they be not such corruptions as ever destroy the foundation and substance of Religion: But there

r
a
e
y
n
t
e
f,
ar
e,
n-
ts
re
is

many of these parts of four were prophane and naughty?
 And yet the Lord Godly and the Proprietor of the Land continue
 the observance of the Ordinances and Worship of God in that
 Church, which is not to leave the Church of the Lord. In the time of
 Christ he continued there upon earth & did not Christ for that
 reason leave the Church to depart and remove from that Church? Or
 did he leave it to some other while he left, continue in the Church
 commending it to himself? Yea wherein does writing a Letter to the
 Church, or to some of whom he wrote, that they had a name that
 they were of the Church, and that there were but a
 few of them that had not defiled their garments? Yet he
 suffered them to continue for pulling down and rooting up and replan-
 ting from the Church Communion in his Ordinances and Wor-
 ship. But that is his direction, in 2. 3. *Be watchfull and stedfastly
 keep that which ye have received, and hold fast, and re-
 plete up to the full.* In some Churches the go-
 vernment of persons hath been so grosse and obstinately
 maintained, that there were no living for Godly and lawfull men
 to prove that they were of the Church, and thus
 the Church was left to the power of the Devil, and it was
 made manifest that the way of Puritan Churches of
 all kinds, allows Churches to be consigned to, of
 the Lord Godly and prophane, and such, that will not follow:
 But if we will, we will win it to be a Church. 5. When
 Churches are to be left to the right form, the
 calling they are united by way of their Church-Covenant, but
 are knit together only by function, and by forraign forensiall El-
 derships: And upon this account, will have them no Churches,
 but only carelesse of Churches. We say, that the Church is
 the congregation of the Saints, and that in the Church the Word of
 God is preached. We say, that the Word of God, that the
 Church which gives the being to the Church Visible, and
 that every member thereof, make profession of, and entering into
 the Church-Covenant with Christ his Son Jesus Christ, and
 every Christian is obliged and engaged to walk in all the
 commandments of God and perform all duties towards God and other Chris-
 tians.

which is the ordinance of Repentance, and the stirring of souls
 with the word will agree with fasting and halving, is
 the stirring of hearts: Can men walk together, &c.
 2. *When they profess again in an Assembly*
 do not think of it.

Here is two Ruffes forsooth, very scandalous separation in-
 grain'd. That any things be corrupted in a Church, suppose,
 wicked and rebellious persons be retained therein and admitted to
 Communion, which therein be the Doctrine of the Gospel
 Preaching, the Sacraments, the acts thereof, and other Ordinances
 for their benefit, might, Godly Christians must separate from
 such Churches, and stay not in the very intimated Ordinances of
 Church, nor yet exercise of worship, join with such Churches,
 wherein such wicked persons join with them. This is the drift
 and notion of this passage, so my dissenting man may perceive,
 who is very intimatedly and compassedly expressed. We must not
 need to rest upon a refutation of this vile error, which has been
 so loudly and fully refused, of old by the Orthodox Antient
 Fathers, and *Doctors in Divinity*, by the first Reform-
 ers of the Reformation, Anabaptists, &c. particularly Mr. *Calvin*,
 and his *Disciples of Presbytery*. I shall for the present note
 but some few things on that which Mr. *Calvin* hath here said.

And first, in the propounding of this tale, in the Object, as it is
 proposed, and comprehensively expressed, *of things be corrup-
 ted in the Church, and a priest or minister may I not walk
 with that Church?* We owe not the affirmative of it. We ac-
 knowledge that it is not lawfull to go on with any Church, in the
 practice of things that are corrupt in it. 1. We acknowledge fur-
 ther, that there may be such corrupt things in Church, or a local
 Church, as to break the name and profession of a Church, so that
 it is not lawfull to go on with such Church or join with them in
 Church communion at all, in where the Worship is professed do-
 heretick, or Doctrine is publicly taught or professed contrary to
 the true foundation of Christianity. But being the case to be
 particular corruption instanced by the Author, and then we say, *that*
*it is a Church, though it be so, to make of discipline, excom-
 munication*

§. 7.

§. 8.

members be admitted. We wished no delay in the admission of the Communion, the Godly indeed ought to be admitted, as testify against such a corruption, to say so. *And* the Minister and Rulers, take heed to your Ministry, to avoid the like abuses in the Church: But ought not to separate from that Church and the exercise of the true Worship, and Ordinances of Christ therein: But, may go on and partake with them, though in warranted a true Worship, participation of the Sacraments, in the exercise of all Gods instituted Ordinances, and in the use of the sin of corrupt fellow partakers to their Ordinances, and the sin of Rulers (unlawfully) admitting such, among Gods Ordinances, Ordinances, as well as if all joining with them, in the same good, and to say that other most wickednesses as those of the same, prejudices or defile these Ordinances to be admitted, as if for my self, and edifying myself, mocking of others abuse, and a wicked error contrary to the design of holy Scripture both in the Old and new Test. which has been abundantly demonstrated by what is mentioned.

- §. 9. Now for his exception against this. To the first, to permit a guilty thing as evil and wicked, and yet daily and continually to go on in the doing of that thing and praising it, is a notorious and mocking of God and man. But daily and continually to go on in the exercise of a lawful and necessary duty, in the company of wicked persons, against whose wickedness I do not sin, and all that is incumbent to maintain station want to such a wickedness, as the thing is more so, as if I am by a wicked person, has no concurrence to the wickedness of others. But there is here in Mr. Lockiers words, a double supposing or begging of the very thing mainly in Question, viz. That if wicked persons be admitted to fellowship in a Church, as to the communion of the word, &c. that the thing the Godly Christian ought to protest or refuse against, is all joyning in the Ordinance when such wicked persons are joining therein with them. This is a very begging of the thing in Question and utterly false. The thing the Godly ought to protest against, is the wicked persons refusing to abstain from the Ordinance, and the Rulers finally permitting them to so do. But as for he does or should protest that a Godly person ought to use the Ordinance

Ordinance of God, or performe constant Worshipping, when wicked men either thrust themselves in with them, or negligent Rulers permit them to do so: is to suppose the thing in Question, and is untrue, and contrary to the current streams of the practice of the Church under the Old and New Testament both, yea to the practice of Jesus Christ himself in the Church of the Jews. To his second exception. 'Tis true, in practical things it is not so much sinners which are the mischief which gives the dislike. But the Question is, whether the performance of a lawful and necessary duty of worship, and use of a true Ordinance of Jesus Christ, for instance, partaking of the Lords Supper to remember his death till he come againe, is to be refused where wicked and scandalous persons will thrust themselves in to do so profanously, or are permitted by Rulers to do so: I have a speciall calling as I am obliged to dilber, as a true and lawful Minister, this is the Question, the negative whereof we hold to be the truth of God held forth in his word. The instance produced by the Author for clearing this his second exception, viz. of a man in an idolatrous Church professing against the Masse, and yet still going to Masse, is to grossely and absurdly importune, and one may wonder how it could be alledged in this passage, by an intelligent man. The Masse is even upon the number one of the grossest Idoltries that ever was in the world. And for a man to go to Masse, when he pretends to protest as against it, is to add, a commission of Idolatry, mocking of God and sinning against him needfully. Such as Mr. Lecker needed not make it a matter of dispute how well such a practice should please God, or deliver the man from guilt. But what is this, to participating of a true Ordinance of Jesus Christ (for instance, the communion of the Lords Table) in a Church not Idolatrous, but only negligent and loose in the exercise of Discipline, and permitting wicked scandalous persons to participate that Ordinance, when the Godly participating with them, testifies against such a abuse in the Ordinances? Nay, can it be freed from great rashness, (I will not say that which I might) to parallell this too together? But yet further to bring in a parallel to clearing his point, *Neamias* practicing of heathenish Idolatry in the house of *Neamias*, amongst a people not so much as professing the true God

God, but Heathenish people professedly, denying the God of Israel, what will intelligent men say to this? To challenge exception. Whether Mr. Lockyer defines *protesting* well, or his peace of revenge, the vehemence of Repentance, or Lawyers judge. To my simple apprehension, protesting, in the nature of it has nothing to do with Repentance, as not removing guiltiness in the person protesting, but being an act whereby he testifies against the insulency and injustice of the doers of some others, that he himself may appear clear and free from the offence in or the accession to it, and preserves himself in a small controversy challenge it before a judge competent. But whether Mr. Lockyer supposeth that a man protesting or testifying against the intrusion or admission of scandalous wicked persons into the participation of an Ordinance of Christ or lawfull assembly of Worship, if he participate in that Ordinance or Worship, when and where scandalous persons participate therein, that in the last man halves and halves, he does but beg the thing which will not be granted to him, and he will never prove. And on begged suppositions to say, *how these will accord, is worthy deep thoughts of heart*, favours of contempt of Readers, if not of some other else. To the fourth, when there is a Protestation against the constitution and very being of an Assembly, 'tis true there is no submitting to it by the Protesters: But yet there may be a protesting against some or more particular deeds of an Assembly when the constitution and being of it is acknowledged, and so such an Assembly submission is not refused or denied by any principles of ours. So there may be a protesting or testifying against some particular abuses in a Church, and yet communion kept with that Church in lawfull, true, necessarie acts of Divine Worship. But if the Author mean, that if such an abuse be in a Church, as that wicked persons are permitted that, or coming to Communion, that in that case, the Godly must protest not only against the deed, but the very thing of that Church, as no Church, and therefore must not joine therewith, in warranted acts of Worship, but separate from its Communion altogether, he will not have the simile of Assemblies and our earriage to them, to go along with him, and it is in it self without warrand contrary to the warrand of Scripture, and we doubt not to say a most Schismatick Assertion.

Mr. Lockyer

Mr. Lock in Sect. 56. and 57. brings and answers a new Objection, and therein saith much all to small purpose, about the causation of Baptisme, as to the constituting a Church. The Objection, is this; *Baptisme give the forme of a true Church: and you say if the forme and foundation be right, it may be capable to purge it self right.* Sir, you are much mistaken, if you think that we hold Baptisme alone to give the forme of a true Church. We say it is the minall seal and solemne entry and admission of Members into the Visible Church; which is a needless Objection to make; it would seeme to vent a new conceit borrowed out of Mr. Hookers *Survey*, part II. c. 5. of a Church without Baptisme. As with a word shortly upon his Answer to this Objection: Only here we say this, that which gives form and being to a Church is the same Doctrine of the Gospel and Covenant of Grace, for the same at least, solemnly avowed by the sealing of Baptisme, and preached by a lawful Ministry. & Lawfull Ministry. I say, as to the essentials of a Gospel-Ministry, these three at least are necessary to give the being of a Gospel Church. And where these are, tho there be many corruptions and defects in the Church, yet it is capable to purge it self from its corruptions, and to supply its defects, and to urge unchurching of such a society, and dissolving of it, as no Church, or totall separation from it, is not of GOD.

But come we to speak a little to the Authors Answer to his Objection: *Baptisme (saith he) doth not give the forme of Church membership.* So say we too; Profession of the true Christian faith is that which giveth the forme of Church-membership *de jure*, Baptisme is the solemne seal thereof. But Mr. Lock, having in his Objection spoken of that which giveth form & being to a Church, how fallth he now to speak of that which giveth form of Church-membership? Is there no more requisite to give form and being to a Church (we are now speaking of a Church Visible). But that which giveth form to Church-membership simply? This is a grosse mistake. Profession of the Christian Faith, *simpliciter*, is that which adequately gives the form and being to Church-membership simply. But to give form and being to a Church, there must be concurring with this, a Ministrell dispensation of the Doctrine

of Faith and Ordinances, by such means as Christ hath instituted them to be dispensed by a Church, existing without a Ministry, complete in the nature and being of a Visible Church, we stand un-
heard of in the Word of God. See *Hud. c. 7. v. 10.*

S. 11.

But to Mr. Lockers purpose in hand. His aim here in his solution is to maintain that Baptism is no way necessary to Church membership. We confess it is not that which giveth the forme and being of a member of the *way*, but yet we say it is necessary as the solemn initial seal of admission into the possession of Church membership in the ordinary way appointed by Christ: The Authors Reasons for this Assertion are these. *There may be a Church, and so consequently members of a Church before Baptism. Infants are before Baptism, and the Church is before Ministers, for out of it are they made and come forth by it.* See this abundantly dashed by *Cauden in his Answer to S. 1. c. 2.* Saith he, *The Church was a little while before the seal, whether Circumcision, or Baptism, and then how could these cause it to be a Church?* *Ans.* What a childish reasoning is that! There was Church without Circumcision: and without Baptism, when neither of them was yet instituted by God. *Here,* after Circumcision was instituted to be the solemn seal of His Church, there might yet been a Jewish Visible Church without it, and now after Baptism is instituted to be a solemn initial seal of the Christian Church, there may be a Christian Church without Baptism: he might as well say that there may be a Christian Church without the profession and belief of that Article: *Ja. 1. the Son of Man is the Christ,* why? the Church was sometime when there was no such Article to be believed.

S. 12.

He addeth to these two Reasons, this prejudice: *Besides how much this gratifieth the judgement and practice of Anabaptists, any one may see, who constitute Church members of baptism, and how much Presbyterians are against Anabaptists, all their writings shew, and how much they lay to our charge for asserting in, and countenancing this Tenent.* *Ans.* How we, holding Baptism to be the seal and solemn admission of Visible Church members, do gratifie the judgement and practice of the Anabaptists in that which is Anabaptism, their excluding of Infants of Christians from

from Baptism I profess myself one that cannot see. The Author would have done well to have assayed to shew us how that any way advantageth their Tenet; Indeed he tryeth true, that Presbyterians are much against Anabaptists Doctrine: But would hereby fasten a peece of doctrine upon them: Because that being so much against that Doctrine, they yet maintain a Tenet concerning Baptisme, that much gratifies, but let him assay to clear this, for it is not enough to say, *they may see it*. What ground there is to looke upon his Tenet concerning the allowed members of the visible Church as tending to Anabaptism, we have the evidence in the 1. part of this Examination: But it seems to me, that in this place the Author does not a little gratifie the judgement of the small enemies of Baptism, and Optimism that account it needlesse amongst Christians. *What* he saies that there may be a Church (he must mean a Christian Church as he speaks on to purpose) before baptism, and that even before they be baptized, being eminent Church officers, making to themselves Ministers: If this to averre that persons may be a Church without baptism, and men may be Ministers of a Christian Church without baptism, if this Assertion be not advantageous to enemies of Baptism, I leave it to the Authors second thoughts.

The last Ojection: But since this opinion prevailed, we see a vast toleration of all strange and damnable Doctrines. This indeed is an heavy prejudice against your way, and the thing in fact is too too palpably true, and you could not here deny it; but only goes about to extenuate, yea and in a great measure to justify it; and so much the more sad is this charge against you, that not only hath this thing, eventually, followed, since your opinion has prevailed: But it tends to this in the very nature of it, while as it attributes to every single Congregation, may be, of seven or ten persons an Independent supreme Ecclesiasticall power in matters of Religion, so that, if any such Congregation should hold and teach any Heretical Doctrine, there is no Ecclesiasticall power on earth that can authoritatively interpose to reclaim or censure them. And for the Civil Magistrate, he, say you, must take heed how he useth his sword for a weed-hook in these *maledictio veritas*. But now briefly see we what the Author returneth in answer to this charge.

S. 15. We are willing to be a terror to our enemies, and a blessing to our friends. We are not so well skilled in the art of war, as to tell what things will be the best. We are willing to be a terror to our enemies, as some would have us, with the sword and the spear, and when we see the fruit thereof, upon all occasions, we give our witness against it, by dispute, discouragement, and other ways, as we understand the Word to warrant us. *Ans.* Alas! Sir, are you so ill skilled in these things, as that you cannot tell what these many vile errors, errors and taught by men in these lands are, which yet to this day are permitted to stand, and are not used against them; and think you that terror can be against such things, to dispute against them? (as for discouragement, which we profess, we can find no discouragement of any man's sin, except amongst us more than elsewhere that the most orthodox of the four other sects of men, who are called them, we know the Word to be for them). Sir, a bold Heretic will care much for all your disputes, yet I believe it is little religion, even this way, that this Author has given against the gross errors of the time: let him show if ever he has moved his tongue, or employed his pen, against Anabaptism, Antinomianism, Arminianism, Socinianism, and other gross errors, which he knows aboundeth amongst his Countrymen both at home and in the Army in this Land, at which has done with much bitterness, against the Government of the Church of England (which yet is according to the truth of God) and if

*I know not he personally, yet the supreme Representative of his not if Mr. Nation, and many of the prime Officers of the Army stand bound by the Covenant and Oath of G O D to maintain and defend. *But* (saith he) if I am and I hear must grow together into the

S. 16. *World, till the end thereof, the Civill Magistrate had need to be wary, that he do not by his Sword, for a word, in his mouth, in his hand, lest Presbytery get a by-blow amongst the rest. Some men's weapons to fight in their quarrels, are to us as Sauls Armour to David, too heavy, we cannot tell how to wield them; because we take a little stone and a sling, when others would take an halberd and a pike, do we then give a vast advantage. War by might, not by power Civill, but by God's Spirit in his Word and other Ordinances, we fight in these quarrels, with weapons the*

the sword shall not be used, but shall be brought down
 upon the heads of the wicked. *Psalm 148.* They are not meer
 magistrates, but are clothed with the Magistrate's Sword should meddle
 with: But as a sword, damnable Doctrines sent to the high
 dishonour of God and seducing of souls from the Love of God
 to the destruction of their souls, under the name of *free of the*
mind, favours little of the true zeal of God, and is reason in
 Presbytery amongst these who call light darkness, for which I
 pray God grant the A. their Repentance. As the Civil Magi-
 strate must use the Sword to be a terror to evil doers, either he
 must use it as a Weed to cut up such Heretical Doctrines, or
 you must say that Heretical Doctrines are no evil works, which
 is to contradict the Word of God in *terminis*. *Philos. 2. 2.* It
 is but an odd way of reasoning, that we would have an *evil* and *cast*
take against the *evil* of every *evil* Doctrines. Indeed
 there be some blasphemous Doctrines, (and not a few of them in
 the time) As a *hater* or a *cross* is too little for the obstinat
 venters of them: but there are others ways whereby the Ci-
 vil Magistrats might employ their power for suppressing false Do-
 ctrines from being brought forth to the dishonouring of God, if
 they were as zealous for Gods honour as they are for their own in-
 terest. While as you do here take off the Civil power from
 meddling with these strange and damnable Doctrines, and allow
 no other means of dealing against them but by the Word and other
 spirituall Ordinances, if you do not give a testimony to the rest of all
 men of common sense judge, the *Passages* of Scripture which are by
 the Author for putting a colour upon the opinion of him, are miser-
 ably abused. For the former, the parable of the tares, I refer the
 Reader to Mr. *Rutherford*.

For the latter, *Zacher. 4. 6.* *Not by might nor by power, but
 by my Spirit saith the Lord of Hosts.* Certain it is from the whole
 context, that the Lords meaning there is this. Between the people
 lately returned from Babilon and now employed in the work of
 building the Temple, were much discouraged in the prosecution
 of the work, by the thoughts of the greatnesse of the work, of
 the greatnesse of the power and opposition of their enemies, and
 of their own weakness, he would have them to know, that it was

* I have
 heard with
 mine ears,
 162: boldly
 avow that
 every man
 anointed
 with the
 spirit, is as
 much a
 Christ, as
 Jesus the
 Sonne of
 GOD.

not by the power of the sword, but by the power of the word, and that therefore they ought not to be allowed, being by power not competent to bear down and remove the greatest inconveniences, and to make the greatest means of stilling the sword. It is true that the word and other Ordinances are ready enough to cast down the strongest fortifications of sinners, but it is therefore a good Argument and Confirmation, the Word of God and other Ordinances are mighty enough to cast down such strong imaginations, as Heretics and Infidels have, that the Church has nothing to do to suppress the teaching of them by the sword and power. If so, there will as well follow, he has nothing to do to suppress, or punish the one breaking of sacred rules, as to suppress, or punish the other. For neither the one nor the other Ordinance of God are ready enough to cast down such as well as the other.

The Author attacks Order in his making up in Church and State, and the things are but disorderly in the Nation, *Præsumptio Imperatoris, ad usum*. To wit that at last he acknowledges that it is, that even are tolerat (for that is the thing he is talking to) and that which disorderly (which yet how it can well with what he hath now been saying in the preceding words, I know not) but if the excuse for this be relevant, I think that God and all judicious indifferent men knowing the present condition of the Nation in twenty years, and what ought to have been done, and what should have been done, had men been willing to have it done for settling truth, and removing things contrary to sound Doctrine, as was undertaken by Covenant and Oath to the most high God to be done.

- §. 17. He saith next, thus, *Sect. 17. 58. Finally Christians take this answer to all that may be further objected. In the enquiring is to be sought, but to be ever learning and never perfecting is dangerous; It was in David's case that Jeremiah wished upon himself, Jerem. 20. 19. It is an heavy burden laid upon that poor soul concerning whom it may be said, the yoke of truth is always great with him, always in fangs and thorns with him, but cannot bring forth. Forsooth, Sir, you have soon done with it. We*

shall take this for answer to all that may be further objected against that you have been pleading for. Stand not upon these objections, but fall to practice, down with our Church Government and Churches to the ground. (this to my conviction is the scope of these words, else I would else I understand them not) sure this man has had a wonderful conceit of what he has been saying in this debate, that thinks we should all be so convinced hereby of the truth of that which he has been pleading for, that that we had twenty Objections more against it then he has touched. (as indeed we have many) yet we should step over all, and do what he hath led us. I will crave leave to say it, I think no man of understanding beside himself, will have such a conceit of it. As for us, we tell him, we are not now to be enquiring about the matter he has been disputing against. I mean whether it be truth or if the contrary manner be true or no. We have desired before God, Angels, and the World, that the Religion established in this Church by the mercy of God, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government of the Church is the truth of God taught in his Word, and we are sure it is so, and as we are bound by the will of God, and our vowes, and Covenants, to abide in the profession and practice of this truth: So we trust that God will establish our hearts with his grace to abide therein. As for such as are fallen away from it, we lament their case, that if they have been moved by any of these things presented by this Author, that they should be so ready to be turned about with every wind of doctrine, the God of grace awaken them to remember where they have fallen, to repent, and do their full work, &c.

APPEND.

APPENDIX.

*Wherein is Examined what is said in the
former and latter of the new Independents of Aber-
deen, for the Independent Congregational and against
the Presbyteriall way of Church-Government.*

6.1.

These Authors utter in what they say on this purpose with
this preface. *For our Presbyteriall Government, and
other thoughts of Quinquaginta it were first born in open
we did a long time suppress them as tentations. Because we had
justly (though implicitly) engaged to the maintenance
of our former way, knowing that Truth cannot suffer by
searce, we brought the matter to the Ballance of the Scales
and whether seeking of God, as he was pleased to give us grace
and what all help which we could have, we profess so far as we
can (with reverence to persons and learned men of another
judgement) the Congregational way comes nearer to the pattern
of the word than the Classicall forme. And so it appears, &c.*

5.1.

Indeed when these thoughts were born in upon them, they
had just cause to look upon them as tentations, and for ought that
they have brought for justifying them here, they may justly yet
look upon them as tentations, as we trust shall appear in the con-
sideration thereof. But here 1. It may be just matter of enquiry to
others, and haply may be of good purpose to themselves to reflect
and consider, when these thoughts began first to be born in upon
them, as well when they began to out any thing of them.
Did we hear any thing of such thoughts in them, but since
the late great revolution of State in this Kingdom, after Worcester
and how soone thereafter did we hear of them by some of the num-
ber, although others thought fit to suppress them some longer?
This may seem to be ground of searching of heart, which is de-

cessary

cessfull above measure. 2. It seemeth by the Authors own confession, that the bearing in of these thoughts upon them at first has been from no good cause or principle; Not from the Spirit of God, unlesse they will say, it has been by an immediate impulse or Enthusiisme. For say they, it was after a long times suppressing of them that they began to consult with the Word of God about them, for that is, as I conceive, to bring them to the ballance of the Sanctuary. 3. If implicately they engaged themselves to the maintenance of the Government defined and settled in this Church, sure then if they will reflect upon the nature and tenor of the engagement, they may find themselves to have committed, in the very act, more sin, than they insinuate here, or I will name. For let them look back again unto the Nationall Covenant, and they shall find that they not only engaged themselves to the maintenance of the Religion professed in this Church in all the points thereof: But also declared and protested themselves under Oath, after due Examination of their own consciences in maters of true and false Religion, to be thoroughly resolved of the Truth thereof by the Word and Spirit of God, and therefore to believe with their hearts, confesse with their mouth, and subscribe with their hands. I do indeed fear that many did run unto that Engagement without such conviction of mind upon clear warrand of Gods Word found by Examination of the maters. And as to do this with so solemne and dreadfull an attestation of God, that they did it upon conviction of conscience, was horrible guiltinesse: So it may wel be apprehended, that God in his holy judgement, has suffered many, for the discovery of the falshood of their hearts (may be in mercy to some, may be in wrath to others) to revolt from these their former Engagements. I wish from my heart these Brethren (so I will yet call them, if they will yet be so called by us) if it be true which they say now, that they engaged implicately, whereas they protested before God that they did it upon through conviction; they would consider this, lay it to heart, and yet againe bring their present way to the ballance of the Sanctuary. I have been with others witness of some who having engaged in the cause of God in these lands, and caried themselves therein for a long time resolutely and actively, and having afterward foully lapsed

into contrary courses, when they have been brought to Repen-
 tance for their backsliding; Have declared that they found that
 their backsliding had arisen from this, that their engaging in the
 cause at first and going on in it formerly, was not upon conviction
 from grounds of the Word of God, but implicitly and for by and
 extrinsecall respects. 4. It is not competent to me to question,
 nor will I question their diligence in seeking of God when they be-
 gan to enquire about this matter (tho it be a thing usual now-a-
 dayes, for men to set out naughtiest wares with this inscription
after seeking of God) but as for using of all helps they could have
 to be cleared, I think some thing may be questioned: For besides
 helps of mens Writings upon this purpose, might they not have
 used the help of the advice of the Judicatories of this Kirk and re-
 presented the grounds of their doubting to some of them. Acts of
 Generall Assemblies require this, that before men vent any inno-
 vations in matters of Religion, they should first peaceably repre-
 sent their Reasons to the publick Judicatures: And albeit, they
 may haply say that the very matters they were questioning was
 the Authority of these Judicatories; Yet humility, if they had
 not overweening conceits of their own wits above the judgement
 of these Judicatures, and charity, if they had so much as they
 ought towards the Church, wherein they were born, baptized in-
 structed, some of them had been for some years Ministers, and
 acting in association in the established Judicatures thereof, might,
 it seemeth, led them to so much. But if they accounted the Ju-
 dicatures unworthy the consulting with, might they not have used
 the help of conference with some of these precious and learned
 men, whom they professe to reverence? If they did consult with
 any of them before they were determined in the matter, yea be-
 fore they did vent their new judgement, is more then I know or
 can learn. But come we to their determination and the confirma-
 tion of it.

fig. 2. So far (say they) as we can see, the Congregationall way comes
 nearer to the patern of the Word then the Classicall form. Here
 it may be asked why they say only that the Congregationall way
 comes nearer to the patern, and not simply that it is the way, con-
 form to the patern of the Word? What, does the Congregation-
 all

all way it self come somewhat short of the patern, and is there a third way distinct both from it and the Classicall, that comes full up to it? Is there here a reservation for a further light? It may be we may hear somewhat of this ere all be done. But go we on to their definition or proposition of the Congregationall way. *To us (say say) it appeareth that Christ hath furnished a Congregation with their Eldership with compleat power of jurisdiction and censure within themselves.* There are here two things asserted by the Authors which accordingly they intend to prove by their two Arguments *respectivè*, afterward built upon the passage of Scripture which they cite. 1. That by Christs appointment the power of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction and censure is in the Congregation (*i.e.* the body of privat professors) and the Eldership jointly (both being to concur formally in the acting thereof) and not only in the Eldership. 2. That any one single Congregation with its Eldership has compleat power of jurisdiction and censure within it self, supremely and without subordination to any larger or superiour Presbyterie. But for further clearing of their minde here it were requisite they should explain these two things to us. 1. Whom they mean by the Congregation contradistinguished from the Eldership, whether the whole collection of Church-members, or only men and those of years of discretion. If the former, then Women and Children must be joint with the Eldership in the power of jurisdiction and censures. If this be their minde we would know it and they would speak it plainly. If the latter, then it is not the Congregation, but some part of the Congregation with the Eldership that has the power of jurisdiction and censure, or else Women and Children are not parts constituent of the Congregation: and then let them tell me where shall they find the name of the Church, in all the Gospel in this notion, taken for the Eldership with the male-professours of adult years, excluding Women and Children? 2. Suppose the whole Eldership of a Congregation be scandalous and censurable who has the power of jurisdiction and censure to exercise toward them? If jurisdiction and censure should be exercised towards them (as I suppose it should be) who has it, and who must do it? If some other Ecclesiastick Court, then should not a single Congregation have compleat

power of jurisdiction within it self, without subordination to any other Ecclesiastick Court in point of jurisdiction. If the Congregation contradistinguished from the Eldership, then the Congregation alone by it self has power enough of jurisdiction and censure; and then what needed it be said *the Congregation with their Eldership*? And indeed this is the way that some Independents goe. In their judgement the Congregation of privat beleivers, does choose, ordain and make their Eldership, and they may, censure, depose, and Excommunicat all their Eldership. So that these Authors when intending a description of the Congregationall way; i. e. the Independent way, they attribute the power of jurisdiction and censure to *the Congregation with their Eldership*, if they mean (as their words seemeth to import, and they must be understood, unlesse they minded to equivocat) that the power of jurisdiction is given to these jointly, and not to either of them severally, either they have not been acquainted with the mind of all these of the Congregationall way, or they have dissembled, the latter of which, I have not reason to impute to all these Authors. The truth is the Authors of the Congregationall way are at a great deal of difference among themselves, even to flat contradictions concerning the subject of the power of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction, as Mr. Caudry has evidenced in the place cited by us before, P. 2. Sect. Go we on to their probation of their Assertion. They cite one passage of Scripture first (telling us withall that there are diverse other Scriptures, which they passe by: But I beleieve it shall be long ere they let us see them) viz. *Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17, 18.* and do build two Arguments on it according to the two things involved in their Assertion. The former lyeth thus in their own words.

TE 3.

The Church there (tell it unto the Church) spoken of, has compleat power of binding and loosing, as is clear from v. 17. and 18. but the Church is not the Classicall Presbytery: But the Eldership with the Congregation: Therefore, &c. The Assumption is clear, because it is not to be found in all the Gospel, that a company of Elders, whether of a Classis or a Congregation, apart from the Congregation is called a Church. Indeed a Congregation with Elders commonly, yea and sometimes contradistinguished from Elders,

Elders, as sometime without Elders, is termed a Church. Act. 15. 4. 22. 23. And Act. 14. 23. Now what an absurdity were it, to reject the usuall acception of the word in the New Test. and without any colour of reason to coine a sense which no where is to be found in all the Gospel, though the word be most frequently used in it.

Ans^r. To passe sundry things which might be noted upon this Argument and for brevities sake to insist only upon that which is materiall, the drift of this first Argument tends to the probation of the former part involved in the Authors Assertion, to wit, that the power of jurisdiction Ecclesiastick is not in the Eldership or Officers of the Church, but in the community of believers jointly with the Elders: and the weight of the whole Argument lyeth upon the signification of the term *Church*. And all which is said is but an old song that has been an hundred times dashed by worthy and learned men already: See what we have said already upon the same alledgeance by Mr. Lockier, above, P. 2. Sect. 3. S. 2. and 3. For the present I shall say but these things on it. 1. When as these Authors say that in the New Testament the name of the Church is taken, sometimes for the Congregation (i. e. in their sense, the community of beleivers) with the Eldership jointly, sometimes for the Congregation as contradistinguished from Elders, and sometime for a Congregation without Elders, and asserteth that here; in this place it is to be understood in the first of these three acceptions, to wit, (as it comprehendeth both Congregation and Elders, I would gladly know, how, and by what Argument they prove that it is so to be understood here, and not rather in one of the other two, for the Congregation as contradistinguished from the Elders, or for the Congregation without Elders. For that we see only asserted by them, but no proof of it brought: Only this much they insinuat, that it is commonly so used: But that will not prove that so it must be taken in this particular place. If they would assayed to bring any Arguments to prove that the name of the Church here must be taken, not for the Congregation as contradistinguished from, or without Elders, but for the Congregation with the Eldership jointly; I doubt not but we should found them all to be such, as speaks power of jurisdiction.

S. 4

tion and government in the Eldership is contradistinguished from the rest of the Congregation. What though the word *Church*, be no where else in the New Testament used for the Elders or Governours of the Church as contradistinguished from the body of believers; yet this is but a very weak Argument to prove that it is not so to be understood here, so be that the genuine grammaticall signification thereof be such; as may well be applied (as indeed the word answering to it in the Hebrew is frequently in the Old Testament applied) to signify a Colledge or Society of Judges or Governours as contradistinguished from the people. See Mr. Hudson, *Vindic. of the Essence and Unity*, &c. 'Tis some rashness in the Authors to call this sense of the word a coined sense. Even prophane Greek Authors have used it in such a sense, I mean for a meeting of Rulers. *Demosthenes* used the word *ἐκκλησία* *pro concione magnatum*. It is yet more then rashnesse, I may say it is a great impudency, that they say, it is *without any colour of reason* taken in this sense in this place. These Authors said before that they have *used all helps they could have* upon this controversie. Now let them tell us did they never read in any Writers upon this controversie of Church Government; who expones the word *Church*, of the Eldership or Governours of the Church so much as *any colour of reason* brought by them for expounding the word in that sense? How can they hold up their face and say this? Did they ever read *Beza* his *Annot.* on the place: Or, Mr. *Rutherford* *Peaceable Plea*, c. 8. Surely the help of these Authors they easily might have had? Sure I am, if they have read these, to mention no more, they might have found some *colour*, at least of reason brought for the Interpretation. Nay, let them but read the latter of the two over again, & I believe they shall find such reason brought for it, as they shall never be able to avoid. Verily whether we take the word *Church* here in a different signification from that whereby it signifies the societie of Visible Christians generally, comprehending private Professours as well as Rulers, or not, yet that not all and every one comprehended under that signification otherwise, but only the Rulers are intended as the persons to whom the publike acts spoken of in the place, receiving of publike delations of scandals, and inflicting of censures does belong,

long, is here invincibly demonstrate because otherwise in the New Testament these acts, as all other acts of Ecclesiastick authoritative Government, are committed and attributed unto the Officers of the Church, as such, *Math. 16. 18. John 20. 21, 22. 1 Tim. 5. 1, 19. Tit. 1. 13. 1 Thess. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 7, 17. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2.* and accordingly to them, as contradicting distinguished from the body of Professors, are given names importing Government and authority. But no where in the Scripture of the New Testament, shall any man therein, either name or thing of Government given to private Professors. We proceed to their second Argument whereby they would prove from that same place that any one single Congregation with their Eldership has power of jurisdiction Independent and Supreme, and to take away all juridicall Ecclesiastick Courts larger than any and Superiour to a Congregation, Classicall or Synodical.

The Church (say they) spoken of in this Text, which has complete power of binding and loosing, is the first Ecclesiastick Judicatorie to which belongeth iudiciall cognizance of offences: For if private admonition do not gains the offender, then the command is sent to the Church: But now Classicall Presbyteries, as, not the first Judicatorie to which appertaines iudiciall cognizance of offences: For first they come to Sessions, and only by refers from the Sessions to Presbyteries. Therefore this Church here spoken of, as having complete power of binding and loosing, cannot be the Classicall Presbyteries, but the Eldership with the Congregation. Nowhere do we read in the Gospel of jurisdiction in relation to censure committed to Classicall Presbyteries.

9. 5

Ans. 1. To the Assumption or second Proposition it seemeth these Authors have not well understood, or been acquainted with the state and way of Presbyteriall Government settled in this Church, and therefore have been too rash and hasty in condemning it or arguing against it before they understood it. For 1. 'Tis not only false which they say, that the Classicall Presbyteries is not the first Judicatorie to which appertaines iudiciall cognizance of offences, but that first they come to Sessions, &c. If this be meant Universally of all offences, Indeed, offences committed by particular persons, settled members of, particular Congregations, and as

5. 6.

yet

yet abiding within the bounds of the Congregation, comes first to the Session or Eldership of the particular or single Congregation. But there are many offences the judicial cognizance whereof comes not first to a Session, but to a Presbyterie; yea may be a Synod, yea may be to the Nationall Assembly. When a private person having fallen into some scandalous sin, and being convened before a Session, addes refractorinesse against the discipline and obstinacie to his former offence, this is a new offence, and the judicial cognizance of this offence belongeth first to the Classicall Presbyterie. So a Classicall Presbyterie is the first Judicatorie to which belongeth the judicial cognizance. Of an offence given by a Minister, in the Administration of his calling; Of an offence given by the Eldership of a Congregation (and indeed supposing the first part of these Authors Assertion, viz. that the power of jurisdiction is given to the Congregation with the Eldership jointly, if they grant not an associate Presbyterie to take judicial cognizance of their offence, they must exempt them from being subject to any judicial cognizance at all: For they cannot come under the judicial cognizance of another single Congregation) Of an offence wherein more single Congregations are alike concerned, and many cases more. I wonder that these Brethren did not remember that the first judicial cognizance, of *James Graham's* offence, of *Seaforts*, and many other publick Malignant wicked practises, was not by Sessions, and from them came by reference to the Classicall Presbyterie, but by the publick Assemblies. 3. It is another grosse mistake too, that these offences which comes to Sessions or Congregationall Elderships to be judicially cognosed upon, and from them comes to the Classicall Presbyterie, or to a Synode, that they come *only by reference* from the Sessions to the Presbyteries. For they come also by appeal of the party who is under the judicial cognition of the Session, upon mal-administration, or supposed mal-administration: They may also and do often come by way of authoritative visitation of Sessions and their proceedings by the Presbyterie.

5. 7. 2. To the Major or first Proposition. 1. Suppose it were granted as it standeth, yet it could not make fully against us, to take away altogether associate judicial Presbyteries of more then one single Congregation: Because, as we have shewn upon the Assumption,

sumption, such associat Presbyteries or Ecclesiastick Assemblies, may be, and must be the first Judicatories, in many cases, to which the judicall cognizance of offences doth belong. But, 1. If the Major be taken in this sense, the Church having power of binding and loosing is the first Judicatorie, to which, &c. And *it only*, taking it with the exclusive note, as it must of necessity be taken, to infer that negative conclusion; *Ergo*, a Classicall or associate Presbyterie is not that Church; We deny it as utterly false having no proof from the Text. We say here that the Church invested with authority to cognosce judicially and inflict censure upon offences is the Rulers of the Visible Church Universall, as joined in *Collegio*, or assembled, whether in the lesser and Inferiour Colleges or Assemblies (as a Congregationall Eldership is in respect of all others; a Classicall Presbytery, in regard of Synods; a Provinciall Synod in regard of a Nationall; this in regard of a Synod of more Nations, haply associate for Government) to which as the first Judicatory matters may come for judicall cognizance, or in larger and superiour, (such as is a Classicall Presbytery in relation to a Congregationall, a Synod in relation to a Classicall Presbytery, &c.) to which, may be, the matter cannot come at first or as to the first Judicatory having power of judicall cognizance of it. 'Tis true, that in such a case as our Saviour instanteth in the Text, when offence is given by one particular member of a Congregation single and fixed in its constitution and proper Officers (which fixing of single Congregations under appropriated Officers, is not necessary by any divine institution: For more Congregations, may be, have been, as it seemeth, in severalls of the primitive Churches, and are at this day in some orthodox Churches served by the same Officers in common without violation of any divine institution.) Christs command *Tell the Church* intends that the matter should be brought to the Eldership of the Congregation as the first Judicature to which belongeth judicall cognizance of it. Like as if the Congregation be not fixed by its self in its constitution and Officers, that Command intends the bringing of the matter at first to an Eldership common to more Congregations. As also if the matter to be judged, be of publick and more common concernment then of one Congregation, that same Commandement, warrands by ana-

logic and proportion, the bringing of the matter first to some more large Presbytery or Colledge of Elders, then the Congregational as the first Judicature to cognosce judicially upon it: But without let it be so observed that when Christ instituteth this order, that offences when they cannot be removed otherwise, should be brought to the Church, that is, to an Ecclesiastick Judicature, he sayeth not, that they may not in any case proceed further for judicial cognition and sentence upon the matter, then to the first judicature to which the judicial cognition of it belongeth; Nor is there any ground in his words, whereupon this can by good consequence be inferred: In a word, there is nothing in this Text either against the juridicall power of larger Elderships then Congregational, such as are Classicall Presbyteries and Synods: Nor against the subordination of Congregational Elderships, to the jurisdiction and authority of such larger Elderships. But upon the contrary, there is in them solid ground whereupon both have been clearly demonstrat by severall Presbyterian Writers, and discussed all contrary exceptions and reasonings upon the place: for shortness, I refer the Reader to. *Ans. of the Assembly of Divines to, &c. pag. 178. Guliel. Appoll. Considerat. of certain Controversies, cap. 6. pag. 94, 95. and pag. 127. Spanhem. Epistol. ad Dav. Buchan. Class. 3. Argv. 2. Hudf. Vindicat. of the Essence and, &c. pag. 156, 157, 158. and pag. 164, 165. Mr. Rutherford. Due Right, cap. 10. pag. 310. & seq.*

S. 8.

To what the Authors adde; *that nowhere do we read in the Gospel of jurisdiction in relation to censure committed to Classicall Presbytery.* *Ans. 1.* If the meaning be no where in the Gospel do we read, this power committed, by a formall precept, to Classicall Presbytery by name, or specifically by it self; it may be granted without prejudice to what we assert (and I pray where will these Authors read in the Gospel this power committed to the Eldership of a single Congregation, specifically, and that as they maintain Independently and supremely?) *2.* It is sufficient for us, if we read in the Gospel this power of Jurisdiction committed to the Officers and Rulers of the Church as united together in Collegio, either in one single Congregation, or over more Congregations combined and associat together as is most convenient for exercise

ercise of their Ecclesiastick communion: And this we read *Mat.* 18. 17, 18. for there, Discipline and Ecclesiastick jurisdiction instituted by Christ is committed unto the Officers and Rulers of the Church as united in *Collegio*: Not to Officers of a single Congregation only, as united; but unto the Officers of the whole Catholick Visible Church of Christ, as united in lesser or larger combinations even to an Oecumenicall Assembly. Because the power of Jurisdiction and Discipline Ecclesiastick there is instituted and intended by Christ to be a remedy against all scandalls and offences in his Church; but all and every sort of scandall falling out in the Visible Church of Christ cannot be so remedied or removed by the Colledge of Officers in a single Congregation. They can only be a means for remedying and removing this way scandalls and offences concerning their particular Congregation, and therefore there must be understood, as intended here by Christ, larger Ecclesiastick Assemblies and Judicatures to exercise Discipline and Jurisdiction for remedying offences and scandalls which Congregationall Elderships cannot reach. 2. It is sufficient if we read in the Gospel approved examples of larger Presbyteries, then Congregationall, Classicall, or Synoditall, authoritatively governing and exercising Acts of Rule over more particular Churches. We read of such a Presbytery as we call Classicall, in *Jerusalem*, *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, Ruling authoritatively more Congregations, as has been demonstrated by severall Learned men. See namely, *Assembly of Divines* in their *Answer to*, &c. upon the proposition 3. of *Presbyteriall Governments*. *In Divin. pers. 2. c. 13.* We read also an example of a Synod exercising such power and authority, *Act. 15.*

With this last instance, doe these Authors meet thus. *All the power we find exercised by the meeting at Jerusalem, Act. 15. is dogmaticall, the people and Brethren having their interest likewise, which the Congregationall Divines willingly yeeld, all the certificat they use, is, if ye do these things ye shall do well, but do not threaten those that disobey with Excommunication.* *Ans.* These things here alleged to conclude this place of Scripture have been often dashed. For the present briefly. 1. These Authors speak warily in calling that Assembly at *Jerusalem* by the gene-

S. 9.

all name of a meeting, and not a Synod; It seemeth here they remembered that what whereas some Congregationall men acknowledge it to have been a Synod, as *Cotton* cited before, P. 2. and *Mr. Lockier*; others finding that not so advantageous for them, deny it, and say only, a reference of one particular Church of *Antioch* to one particular Church of *Jerusalem*, as the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly at *Westminster*. *Papers of the Assemb.* pag. 128. and therefore have chosen a name that might serve both, and so displease neither. But that it was a Synod, see cleared by *Jus Divin.* P. 2. C. 14. 2. Suppose it did not exercise a criticall power, or power of censure, yet it followeth not that it had not a power of censure to exercise. On the contrary, the dogmaticall power of a Synod being of another sort then the dogmatical power which is competent to a single Pastour, this being only concionall, and an act of the power of order, this is juridicall and an act of the power of jurisdiction, and of the Key of Discipline, it carrieth along a power of censure with it. Tho this be not alwayes put in actual exercise when the other is: There may be, and often is need of a juridicall determination of a case by a Judicature, when there is not occasion of exercising of censure by that Judicature, as is evident. 3. It is contrary to clear truth that all the power that Synod exercised is dogmaticall. For besides their exercising a dogmaticall power in confutation and condemnation of the Heresie taught by the Judaizing Teachers, and vindication of the truth about the great point of Justification by faith alone, without the works of the Law. They do also exercise a diatactical power for healing the scandall of the weak Jews especially, and their alienation of mind, from the Gentile Christians who neglected their ceremoniall observances, by making and enjoining a practicall canon, ordaining the Gentiles to abstaine from some things that might any wayes occasion their offence. And also a criticall power or power of censure against the schisme or *sciss* raised by the false Teachers, branding them with the black mark of liars, subverters of souls, and troublers of the Church: This was a degree of censure, and a virtuall admonition tending to further censure: But actually to have proceeded further to Excommunication, at first was not seasonable, prudent nor needfull. 4. If people and private

vate Brethren were in that Synod (as we deny not but they might be) their interest in the determinations and consultations of the Synode was not by way of authoritative and definitive vote : But at most consultative and by way of private consent and approbation , as we cleared before against Mr. *Lockier*. 5. That recommendation of obedience to the acts of that Synode from the goodnesse and benefite thereof , expressed in the close of the Synodical letter, doth not argue their constitutions not to have been made and enjoined by an authoritative power obligeing under hazard of censure. The most authoritative acts of any juridicall Court , being sent in a respective way , may be so recommended in such a way. Neither that , that in the constitutions of that Synode there is not an expresse and formall threatning of those that disobey with censure, doth import by any necessity of consequence , that the power they exercised was not authoritative, and such as might proceed to censure. Juridicall courts do not alwayes adde to their constitutions expresse and formall comminations of punishment : Here especially it was not necessarie, it being a clear case in it self that those Hæreticks and Schismaticks who could by no other means be reduced , were not to be suffered but censured and cast forth.

Now is this , which we have been considering , the pith and strength of the grounds , whereupon these Authors have not only §. 10. adventured themselves , to desert and separate from this Church : But also have darred to advise the Brethren to whom they directed their Epistle , to appear with them upon the head of the businesse, (that is , to put to their hands as chief actours , to throw down to the ground that beautifull order of Government in this Church, by the Officers of Jesus Christ appointed to rule his Church on earth, in Congregationall and Classicall Presbyteries, Synodes Provinciaill and Nationall, ordered in a sweet and excellent subordination among themselves , which was after the first Reformation , upon much deliberation for many years, settled in the Church as warranted and grounded upon the Word of God , was afterward , when opposed, born down and oppressed, sealed by many precious servants of Jesus Christ , with bitter and grievous sufferings , of Imprisonment , Banishment , and even sentences unto death (which the only

only hand of God restrained from being put in execution) and was again by the good hand of God upon his people in this land, after long oppression under Prelacie, raised up; has been attested by forraigne Divines and Churches as the true Government of Jesus Christ in his Visible Church; has been alwayes the hammer to break wickednesse and prophanitie, and the hedge to keep out Errours, Hæresies and Schismes; made this Church against all evil doers and enemies of truth, terrible as an Armie with Banners, which at this day is the eye fore of all the Sects and Hereticks of the times, & the butt of Satans malice, to throw down and raze this to the ground (which some of the same Reverend men to whom they wrote, have through the grace of God, to their praise in all the Churches, Vindicated against all enemies thereof upon one hand and other, and stand engaged by solemne vows, and the dreadfull Oath of God to maintain and defend to their lives end) to set up, I wot not what, and I think the Authors themselves wots not what) and if they do not this, to threaten them with the streaching out of GODS hand, and to lay upon them the horrid imputation of being snares to GODS people? O Lord, how terrible are thy judgements in these times as upon outward things, so upon the Spirits of men, while men are thus caried about with every winde of Doctrine! What need have these that professe the Truth, to take heed that they have received it in love, lest they be given up to believe lies?

- S. 11. The Authors adde only, *That there might be somewhat said from antiquity, that the Government of the Church was partly Aristocraticall, partly Democraticall, in much of the first three hundred years, and that the people had no small influence in matters of Discipline, but that they forbear, as desiring to leane on a surer foundation.* Ans^r. What they have produced of this surer foundation; i. e. the Holy Scripture, to leane themselves upon in their departure from the Church of God in this land wee have seen, and how little ground it affords to sustain them, we have seen too. I wish from my heart they had brought somewhat also, though it had been but a little, of that which they alledge may be said from antiquitie of these ages for their respect of Church Government, For in truth we professe our selves to be such as reverence

reverence very much, under the Holy Scriptures (which wee leave to only, as the foundation of our faith in all maters of Religion) the testimonie of the Orthodox Churches in these ages. Mr. Lockier, as we saw before, undertook somewhat of this before, *magno biaru*, under the name of *common consent*, but what he produced to instruct it, may blush before all men that has any wit, and are not stark fools: And I am perswaded what these Authors would have produced, had they assayed it, should have proven as little to their purpose.

There are two main points whereof the Independent Government consists. §. 12. 1. That the power of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction is in, and formally to be exercised by the communitie of Professours, if not wholly and by themselves, yet jointly with the Elders and Officers, they as well as the Elders concurring authoritatively, in all acts of Government and jurisdiction. 2. That there is not any larger Judicatorie or Assemblies Ecclesiastick, than of a single Congregation, whether Classicall Presbyterie or Synod, juridicall; But that the Judicatorie of every single Congregation is the supreme Ecclesiastick juridicall court upon earth, Independent upon and without subordination to any larger or Superiour Ecclesiastick Judicatorie. They grant indeed some sort of Synods, but denude them of all authoritative and juridicall power over particular Churches, leaving them only power of advice and counsell; or at most a dogmaticall power to determine cases and questions in Religion: but without power authoritatively to enjoin their determinations upon particular Churches, so as to oblige them to be censurable in case of disobedience, or to inflict any censure at all upon offenders.

Now 1. suppose (which yet cannot be granted) that somewhat might be brought from antiquitie to shew that there was in the Government of the Church then a mixture of Aristocracie and Democracie, and that the people had some influence in the exercise of Government: Yet none dare be so impudent as to alledge that antiquitie for the second point of Independent Government. I think these Authors, some of them at least (for others of them, though they all speak in this Epistle referring this to antiquitie, yet we may acquite from all guiltinesse of acquaintance with antiquitie) §. 13.

tie) knew this very well : And therefore they have wittily enough expressed this reference to antiquitie, in that, whereas in their two former Arguments, they affirmed these two points of Independent Government distinctly, now in this reference to antiquitie, they alledge only generally and confusedly, that there was then a mixture of Aristocracie and Democracie, and that the people had no small influence in Discipline. There is nothing more clear and undenyable in humane Historie then authoritative juridicall Governing Assemblies and Synodes of more Churches in these ages of the Church. Oecumenicall Synod, there were none (nor could be, because of the evils of these times) after the dayes of the Apostles untill the Nicen Council, yet the thing it self was acknowledged, could the benefit thereof been had, as is evident by that of Cyprian, *Lib. 1. Epist. 8. in Pamel. order. Epist. 40. Cum semel placuerit, tam nobis quam confessoribus & clericis urbicis, item Universis Episcopis vel in nostra Provincia, vel trans mare constitutis, ut nihil innovetur circa lapsorum causam, nisi omnes in unum convenerimus & collatis consiliis cum Disciplina pariter & misericordia temperatam fixerimus sententiam.* That Provinciall Synods (i.e. of many neighbouring Churches having Colledges of Presbyters and Officers over them) were then in actuall use is so clear as cannot be denied. See the *Magde. burgen Cent. 2. Cap. 7. in princip.* they say. *Duplex atque regiminis Ecclesiastici forma (ut hoc saculo) sese nobis offert consideranda, quarum prior communem singularum Ecclesiarum Administrationem: Altera vero plurium aut omnium inter se consociatarum gubernationem complectitur* (note here by the way, that those *singula Ecclesia*, particular Churches, to which they give *privatas Synodos* afterward, were not, alwayes at least (as we shall shew after this) such single Congregations as the Independents stand for, which may meet together at one time in one place, but more ample. Then afterward, p. 135. *De consociatione Ecclesiar.* they say, *si quando Hereses oboriebantur aut alia Quæstiones graviore; Tum conveniebant vel omnes provinciales, aut plerique Doctores: Et examinata re communi iudicio statuebant, quod vitandum aut sequendum esset, Euseb. l. 3. c. 16. Ex Appollinario dicit: etenim fideles per Asiam multis sa-*

pe numero Asia locis ob hanc causam conveniebant, & nuper namque Doctrinam examinabant, & profanas pronuntiabant, hereticiq; istam reprobantes Ecclesiâ ejiciebant & Excommunicabant. *Wike manner Cent. 3. c. 7. titul. De consociatione plurium Eccles. in unâ aliquâ Provinciâ, p. 158.* Diximus superiori seculo, Ecclesias ejusdem Provinciæ solitas esse plerumq; ad unam aliquam maximè insignem respicere, eamq; venerari, & ab ea consilia & mutua officia petere & rectè monitis obtemperare: Ea vero res ut paulatim in consuetudinem abiit, ita hoc seculo observata est: Nam in plerisq; Provinciis, cetera Ecclesia, eorumque Episcopi & Clerici, se ad ejusmodi alienius urbis Episcopum, Doctrinâ, pietate & constantiâ insignem, & sacerdotum Collegium associant, ut eorum operâ tanquam communium inspectorum & gubernatorum uterentur. And in the same *Cent. p. 163. l. 40.* De consociatione Univers. they say. Si autem graviores Quaestiones aut controversiæ incidebant, aut alia negotia qua non ad unius Provinciæ Ecclesiæ attinebant sed ad plures, tum Ecclesia etiam in diversis Provinciis suas operas conjungebant, in petendis aut dandis consiliis, in componendis schismatibus, in refutandis erroribus, in Congregandis Synodis, in Excommunicandis Hereticis & aliis facinorosis. See also after. pag. 166. l. 22. & seq. See also. *Cent. 4. c. 7. p. 517. l. 21. & pag. 522. l. 8.* But why insist we in this, instances of Synods of this kind, exercising juridicall power authoritatively (I mean Ministeriall authority subordinat to the Word of God) determining Questions in Religion, condemning Heresies, Excommunicating Hereticks, Schismatics, and other flagitious persons, in these ages are not our to all that have read any thing of antiquity. *Cyprian* alone in his *Epistles* affordeth abundant testimony of this. And as for Clasticall (as we call them) Presbyteries, what else were the Bishop with his Presbyterium, or Collegium sacerdotum*, in these times, * VVhich the Centurists call Synodos privatas singulorum Ecclesiarum. I shall not contend here whether in these times there were any single Congregations having a full Presbyterium within themselves, albeit I think it shall be hard for any man to give any particular instance in these ages of a Presbyterium of one particular Congregation such as our Independent Brethren speak for. But certain

certain it is, that the Bishops (who were then but constant presidents differing from other Presbyters, *ordine tantum non gradu aut potestate*) with their *Presbyterium*, or *Collegium Clericorum* for the most part were *Diocesan*, i.e. over such numerous Churches as could not be one single Congregation, to meet in one place at one time for divine Worship, but behoved to be made up of many such single Assemblies (which whether they were fixed or not fixed, we debate not now, nor does the one or the other make any oddes in the purpose we are now upon) and so was just such a Presbytery as we call Classicall: such was *Cornelius* in *Rome* with his Presbytery, and *Cyprian* with his Presbytery in *Carthage*, and other Bishops with their Presbyteries in other populous Cities. Certain it is that these Presbyteries were juridicall Ecclesiastick Courts: And as certain it is that they were not Presbyteries of one single Congregation, such as Independents speak of.

- S. 14. As for the other point of Independent Government, if we speak of the authoritative and juridicall Acts of Government (such as are Ordination and potestative mission of Ministers, judicall determination of controversies in Religion, Excommunication of Heretical and scandalous persons) I darre affirm that in antiquity a man may as soon find a mixture of Aristocracy and Democracy, let be Morellian, or compleat Democracy (which yet is the thing maintained by most part Independents) as in *sylois Delphinum*: We shall not deny that the people then had an hand in the election of Ministers, as is evident by many passages of these times, see especially, *Cyprian lib. 1. Epist. 4. in Pamel. Ord. Epist. 68*. But election is no act of Ecclesiastick Authority or Government, nor doth it constitute any one a Pastour, but is only a designation of the person, to be authoritatively put in that Office by ordination, or to be applied to some particular charge, if he be one already in Office. Nor do we deny but the people might be present at the handling of matters of faith in Assemblies, be hearers and witnesses of the whole proceedings thereanent, give their counsell and advice in consultation, also testifie their assent and approbation to the determinations: We grant also that Excommunication and loosing from Excommunication of persons was not performed

must without at least the tacit agreement and consent of the people. They are to concur *active* and *executive* to both; And therefore when any person was to be Excommunicat, the grounds and causes thereof were made known to the people: And when persons Excommunicat were to be received again into the Church, they were brought before the people to make their *εὐχολογίην* publick confession before them, as we do in our Churches now, but none of these, nor all of them, amounts to an authoritative and juridicall power of Government. But as for such acts as belong directly to authoritative and juridicall Government, as Ordination of Ministers, judicall sentencing persons to be Excommunicat, or absolution from Excommunication, giving of definitive sentence in publick determinations of controversies of faith, or of matters pertaining to order, and rites to be observed in the Church, let our Authors produce any testimony, or allowed practice, of the peoples formall influence and concurrence in these, if they would say any thing from that antiquity for an Ecclesiastick Government properly Democraticall, either in whole, or in part.

Hierome, who was near these ages, and better acquaint with their way, then these Authors, tells us in the generall, in whose hands the power of Government was then, in that remarkable and famous saying of his, on the Epistle to *Tit. c. 1. Antequam Diaboli instinctu studia in Religione fierent & diceretur in populo, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cepha, Communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesia gubernabantur, &c.* See what learned *Chamier* sayeth on this of *Hierome*, *lib. 10. de Oecumen. Pontif. c. 5. §. 22.* Answering to *Bellarmin.* his *Arg. Respondeo ad primum etiamsi Aristocratia non sit totidem syllabis nominata, tamen certo significatam his verbis, Communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesia gubernabantur, &c.* And he adds, *bonam autem fuisse id regimini formam, inde sequitur, quod ab initio fuisse dicat (Hieronymus) cum in Ecclesia id sit optimum quod verissimum, id autem verissimum quod primum: Dicit etiam (Hieron.) fuisse ex institutionis Dominica veritate* And mark in this same Learned Author whose words I am now citing, that the very thing he undertakes to demonstrate in that, *c. 5.* and some following

both from Scripture and antiquity, is that the government as well of particular, as of consociat Churches was pure *Aristocracy*.
c. 5. §. 1.

§. 16. More particularly. 1. That ordination and imposition of hands (which only is the authoritative act in the Calling of a Minister, and that which conferreth (Ministerially under Christ) a Ministeriall power) was in these primitive times the proper and peculiar act, of the Ministers of the Church, or the Presbytery, is so evident and clear to all that has read any thing of these times, that it were waste of time and paper to produce testimonies for it. Indeed we find in antiquity, that after that once there began a constant praesident to be set up in the Presbytery, with the name of Bishop (which in Scripture is common to all Presbyters) appropriat to him alone, somewhat of the Act of Ordination began also to be peculiar to him, and as he advanced in his *ἐπισκοπή*, prehemineny above Presbyters, so was the power of ordination more and more deferred to him or usurped by him alone, and hence came that point of difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter, of which *Jerome* in his time. *Quid facit excepta ordinatione Episcopus quod non facit Presbyter?* But that ever the people had any formall concurrence in ordination of Ministers is a thing unknown to antiquity.

§. 17. 2. That the power and exercise of the Keyes of Discipline, of binding and loosing, sentencing unto censure, and absolution from censure, also was only in the hands of the Colledge of Presbyters in those times of the Church, is as evident to such as are any ways acquainted in them. *Origen. Hom. 7. in Iosnam. tertio admonitum respicere nolentem, jubet ab Ecclesia corpore defecari, per Ecclesia praesides.* The *Centuriators, Cent. 3. c. 7.* tells us that then, *Ius tractandi de Excommunicandis, aut recipiendis lapsis publice penes Ecclesia Seniores erat qui ad eam rem convenire solebant*, and they cite for this, *Tertullians Apologeticus*. The order then observed in receiving penitents, that had offended by grievous scandalous sins, is most clear for this, they were first to compear before the Bishop and his Clergy, i. e. the Presbytery, (wherein the Bishop then differed from other Presbyters, ordine

TANINUM

tantum nou graph) by them the penitents cause was judicially cognosed, the manner of satisfaction prescribed and enjoined to them; And having performed that, and made their *isacodis*, before the people, they were actually absolved, by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop and Clergy, or the Presbytery. *Cyprians Epistles* are full of testimonies to this purpose. It were needlesse labour to insist in citation of them: Only I think it worth the pains to produce one Passage, whereby it may evidently appear that the way of absolving and receiving penitents was just as it is now in the Presbyterian Government, as to the matter and substance. It is in *lib. 3. Epist. 11. in Pamel. Ord. Epist. 46.* from *Cornelius Bishop of Rome* to *Cyprian*, concerning the return of some Confessours from the Novatian schism to the unity of the Church there: *Cornelius* after he has related how these Confessours, had expressed their desire of reconciliation, to the Presbyters, and taken with the faults laid to their charge in a privat and extrajudiciall way, he proceedeth thus. *Omni igitur actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium. Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinque qui & hodie presepes fuerunt, ut firmato consilio, quid circa personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium statueretur. Et ut motum omnium, & consilium singulorum dignosceres, etiam sententias nostras placuit in notitiam vestri perferri, quas & subjectas leges. Huiusmodi gestis in Presbyterium venerunt Urbanus, &c. Et plerique fratres qui se iis adiunxerant, summis precibus desiderantes, ut ea qua ante fuerunt gesta, in oblivionem cederent, nullaue eorum mentio haberetur ——— quod erat consequens omnia hic actus populo erat insinuandus ut & ipsos viderent in Ecclesia constitutos.* Having related the peoples expression of their joy he sets down the confession which the penitents made. *Nos errorem nostrum confitemur, &c.* And then addeth, *istâ eorum professione non moveremur? Ut quod apud potestatem seculi erant confessi, in Ecclesia constituti comprobarent: Quamobrem Maximum Presbyterum, iussimus locum suum agnoscere, ceteros cum ingenti populi suffragio recepimus.* I need not comment upon the place, it speaks plain enough of it self what we are pleading for.

3. That

§. 18. 3. That the giving of definitive sentence in questions of faith, or making Ecclesiastick constitutions and canons concerning order to be observed in the Church, in these ages did ordinarily pertaine only to Ministers of the Church, Bishops and Elders, & that though others privat Christians might be present, hear and consult, that yet these only did sit and vote as ordinary Judges, is undenyable clear by the Historie of all Councils that were then held in the Church: I say ordinary. For I deny not but that sometimes such as were not in any such Ministeriall office, did also sit and concur in giving definitive sentence: But these were not any whatsoever privat Christians promiscuously: But eminent learned and pious men, and having authoritie and calling thereunto, either by antecedent agreement of the Churches that were to meet in the Assembly, or by a subsequent assuming and calling of them by the Assembly it self. Which was an especiall vocation unto the Ministeriall office; *ad tempus* and in relation to these particular acts which were to be done in the Synode, and in so far did exempt them *à sorte*, out of the state of meer private Christians: But that such as were meer privat Christians, *i. e.* were neither ordinary Ministers, nor had a speciall calling *extra ordinem*, concurred to give definitive sentence in Assemblies, was a thing unknowne. See what Junius, a man well versed in antiquitie, sayeth to *Bel-larm. Cont. 3. lib. 2. c. 25. n. 2.* speaking in relation to ancient Councils. *Eorum qui Conciliis intersunt, varia esse genera; Esse audientes qui in Doctrina & ordine ex auditione informantur: Esse doctos, qui ad consultationem adhibentur: Esse denique Episcopos & Presbyteros, qui decidunt res ferendis sententiis:* And again, *Cont. 4. lib. 1. c. 15. n. 15. qui sine auctoritate Ecclesie adjunt, eorum alii etiam consultationibus adhiberi possunt, ut docti, præterim Ecclesiastici, sed dicere sententiam definitivam non possunt.*

§. 19. I hear of two main Objections which use to be made against what I have been pleading for, and for the concurrence of the people in the exercise of the Government of the Church. 1. That is alledged of the *Magdeburg. Cent. 2. c. 7. p. 134. cate-nem si quis probatos auctores hujus sæculi. perspiciat, videbit for-*

man.

nam gubernationis propemodum Augustinæ similem fuisse. To which may be added that of learned Whitak. Cont. 4. q. 1. c. 1. *scilicet partim Aristocraticum, partim Democraticum, partim etiam Monarchicum* (n. si velimus Christum ipsum respicere, as sayeth a little before) *est, semperque fuit Ecclesiæ Regimen.* Ans. w. That these Authors called the Government of the Church, either much like unto a Democratically, or in part Democratically, their meaning and intention was not, that the whole body of private Professours did formally concur in the exercise of such acts, as are formally authoritative and judicall acts of Government, (which were requisite to make the Government formally and properly Democratically, either in whole or in part) But only because of such things competent to them, as we have mentioned, §. 14. which are no authoritative or judicall acts of Government. And first for the Magdeburg. see how they explicate that which they say in the next following words. *Singula enim Ecclesiæ parem habebant potestatem verbum Dei pure docendi, Sacramenta Administrandi, absolvendi & excommunicandi Hæreticos & sceleratos, & ceremonias ab Apostolis acceptas exercendi, aut etiam pro ratione edificationis novas condendi, Ministros eligendi, vocandi, ordinandi, & justissimas ob causas iterum deponendi* — In these words there are two things expressly observable to our purpose. 1. That they in explicating the Democracy they speak of, speak not of the power of single persons as to matters of Government, but of single or particular Churches. *Singula enim Ecclesiæ* (say they) *parem habebant potestatem, &c.* whereby it may easily and evidently appear, that while they say that the Government of the Church was much like a Democracy, they mean this, not to take away the Government out of the hands of Christs Officers of the Church, to put it in the hands of the whole people, at least to joine these with them in the formall and proper actings of it; But in opposition to that authoritative and juridicall superiority of any one particular Church over other particular Churches, as the Prelaticall men pleaded for authoritative superiority in their cathedrall Churches, over all particular Churches in the Diocese, and the Papalins for an universall superiority and supremacie in the Church

Church of *Rome* over all other Churches in the world. It is to be observed that among other things which they reckon up as parts of the Church Government which they say was much like Democracy, they put in, the Preaching of the Word, and Administration of Sacraments, which themselves before say (and no man of sound judgment will deny) are acts proper to the called Ministers of Christ: Whence also, it is manifest that they mean not a Democracy properly so called, which putteth the formal power and exercise of Government in the hands of all and every one of the multitude, which the Independent Brethren plead for. And indeed will any man consider, what the particular Churches were, to which these Centuriators attribute private Synods (*Cent. 3. c. 7. pag. 130.*) wherein it may possibly be conceived, that Democracy could have place especially, and it may easily be perceived that they were such, as the whole body of the people (for whose right to concur in juridicall acts, the Independent Brethren pleads) could not possibly meet together in one, or be present at once, in their Synods when assembled for exercise of jurisdiction. For most part, at least of them which they call particular Churches, were of such amplitude, and so numerous, that such an assembling of their whole body was not possible, and in truth they were Diocesan or Presbyteriall Churches, and not such single Congregations, as the Question between us and the Independent Brethren concerneth. For mention in that very place last cited, speaking of these particular Churches and their private Synods, they bring in the *Roman* Church for an instance: And who knows not how numerous the Christians in *Rome* were become ere that time. Add to these things that these same Authors, *Cent. 3. c. 7. p. 151.* say expressly that *pro reuocandi de excommunicandis aut recipiendis publice lapsis, penes Seniores Ecclesie erat, and tunc Tertull. Apolog. forit; read also c. 6. ejusdem Cent. pag. 129. l. 30. de re tibus circa claves, and you will finde that the judicial power of Discipline was not common to the people but proper to the Ministers, only some interest therein was for honours sake, given to Martyres.* As to that cited from *Whitaker*, the learned Theologian himself, in the words immediatly going before the cited

in what respect it is that he sayes the Government of the Church was alwayes in part Democraticall, when he saith. *Sicut corpus Ecclesie (n. volumus respicere) quatenus in electione Episcoporum & Presbyterorum suffragia ferebat, ita tamen non minus super a Presbyteris servaretur, Democraticum.* So when he call it partly Democraticall, in this respect that the people had vote in the election of their Ministers, which we grant the people ought to have, and if any will in this respect call the Government of the Church in part Democraticall, we shall not contend about the name, only we will say that the election of Ministers, being no more but the nomination or designation of a person to the Ministry, is no proper or formall act of authoritative power.

The other Objection made use of is from Cyprian. *Lib. 1. Epist. 10. in Pamel. Ord. Epist. 6. Ad id vero quod scripserunt mihi, Donatus & Fortunatus, Novatus & Cyprianus solus rescribere nihil potui; quando à primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine Consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis, mea privasim* ^{*Pam. mea, privata sententia.} *sententia gerere. Am.* How far that grave, pious and zealous ancient was from the Independent way of Church Government, amongst many places in his Writings, that one famous Passage in *Lib. 1. de Unitate Ecclesie*, doth abundantly demonstrate, and cleareth as with Sun-shine. *Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: Ego dico tibi, &c.* to these words. *Hanc Ecclesia unitatem.* And again a litle after from these words, *quam unitatem firmiter tenere, &c.* to these, *quomodo Solis multi radii.* This place as it shews down the Antichristian Papall Monarchy, so it is a clear testimony against popular and supreme Independent Government in a single Congregation; while as therein the Author so clearly asserteth the power of the Keyes to have been given by Christ and put in the hands of the Apostles, in an equall society of honour and power. 2. That there is one Catholick Visible Church, and that this Catholick Church, is but one charge. *Unus Episcopatus cuius à singulis in solidum pars tenetur.* And that, *unitatem hanc firmiter tenere & vindicare debent Episcopi qui in Ecclesia præsident, ut Episcopatum quoque ipsum, unum etq. indivisum probeant.* Then which nothing could be said more forcibly, against that

Ecc

Crombie

of the Church into so many single Congregations
 dependent in themselves and without all union and conjunction
 point of Government. But to the place in hand cited from *Epist.*
to lib. 2. Onfarrini and Junius Notes on the place clear the
 matter well for us. *Nempe agebatur de aliquo electione*
quam Cypriano quidam e Presbyteris suggererent, eo quo
Ecclesia ex persecutionibus parce sui Presbyteri destituta
esset. Respondit nihil scire hac enim unquam facere univ
ersum & Presbyterum Consilium & plebs consensum adhibere
 But what is the place and part of the people in election, we contro-
 vert not. Nay, we say with the same Ancient, *Lib. 1. Epist. 4.*
Quando ipsa plebs maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos
sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. And as he says afterward
Eligendus Episcopus immaculatus & integer presencie plebe. &c.
 But shew me a place in that Writer ascribing to the people formal
 concurrence with the Officers of the Church in any juridicall au-
 thoritative Acts of Government, as in Ordination of Ministers, sen-
 tencing persons to censure, to Excommunication, and absolving from
 Excommunication, judicall and definitive determination of contro-
 versies in Religion. But now this Book having grown to bignesse
 beyond my Intention at first, I will insist no further, but leave these
 Brethren I have been last speaking with my hearty desire to God on
 their behalf, that he would shew them mercy, to remember from
 whence they have fallen, repent and do their dutt works.

FINIS.

